

[Mr. HOLLIS] has not voted, being absent. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The result was announced—yeas, 24, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Borah	Harding	Page	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Kenyon	Penrose	Townsend
Clapp	Lodge	Sherman	Warren
Cummins	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	Watson
Fernald	Norris	Smoot	Weeks
Gronna	Oliver	Sterling	Works

NAYS—28.

Bankhead	James	Owen	Simmons
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.
Gore	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Smith, S. C.
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Swanson
Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Underwood
Husting	Overman	Shields	Williams

NOT VOTING—44.

Ashurst	Dillingham	Lane	Ransdell
Beckham	du Pont	Lee, Md.	Reed
Brady	Fall	Lewis	Robinson
Broussard	Gallinger	Lippitt	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Goff	McCumber	Stone
Catron	Hardwick	McLean	Thomas
Chilton	Hollis	Myers	Thompson
Clark	Johnson, Me.	Newlands	Tillman
Colt	Jones	O'Gorman	Vardaman
Culberson	Kern	Phelan	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kirby	Polindexter	Walsh

So Mr. SUTHERLAND's amendment to the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], which I accepted. It is really the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is "Shall the bill pass?"

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. SUTHERLAND called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Owing to the absence of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, I shall withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], who is absent. For that reason I withhold my vote. If privileged to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] is necessarily absent at the present time. I am paired with him for the afternoon. If he were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. He is absent from the Chamber, and I withhold my vote. Were I permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have a pair with that Senator. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). In the absence of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLISS] I withhold my vote, having a general pair with that Senator. Otherwise I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OWEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Bankhead	La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Lane	Reed	Stone
Fletcher	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Swanson
Gore	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Tillman
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Underwood
Hughes	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Williams
Husting	Overman	Simmons	
James	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—25.

Borah	Harding	Penrose	Warren
Brandeggee	Kenyon	Sherman	Watson
Clapp	Lodge	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
Clark	Nelson	Smoot	Works
Cummins	Norris	Sterling	
Fernald	Oliver	Sutherland	
Gronna	Page	Townsend	

NOT VOTING—38.

Ashurst	Dillingham	Kirby	Ransdell
Beckham	du Pont	Lewis	Robinson
Brady	Fall	Lippitt	Smith, Md.
Broussard	Gallinger	McCumber	Thomas
Bryan	Goff	McLean	Thompson
Catron	Hardwick	Myers	Vardaman
Chilton	Hollis	Newlands	Wadsworth
Colt	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Walsh
Culberson	Jones	Phelan	
Curtis	Kern	Polindexter	

So the bill was passed.

PROHIBITION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1082, to prevent the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, be printed for the information of the Senate, showing in small capitals the amendments offered by me March 14, 1916.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 8, 1916, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 7, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we pray for a universal faith that shall dispel doubt, a universal hope that shall eliminate despair, a universal love that shall sweep away hate and place the star of love in the ascendancy; that Thy kingdom may indeed come in the hearts of men everywhere and abolish war with its wide desolation and unmitigated evils, that the pursuits of peace may reign supreme and every home be typical of the heavenly home, and the old earth blossom as the rose; in the name of the

King of Peace, who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate concurrent resolution 27.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee, consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President elect of the United States on the 5th day of March next.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by my colleague Mr. MOTT delivered yesterday at the National Rivers and Harbors Convention.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered yesterday at the Rivers and Harbors Convention by his colleague Mr. MOTT. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

FISH-CULTURAL STATIONS IN CERTAIN STATES.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the bill H. R. 15617, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15617) to establish fish-hatching and fish-cultural stations in the States of Alabama; Louisiana; Florida; Georgia, South Carolina, or North Carolina; Maryland or Virginia; Oregon or Washington; Texas; Oklahoma; Illinois; Washington; Arizona; New Mexico; Michigan; Idaho; Missouri; Pennsylvania, Delaware, or New Jersey; and Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BENNET. To move to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. BENNET. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send the motion to the desk.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BENNET moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries with the following amendment: Page 2, after line 3, insert:

"State of Wisconsin, \$50,000.

"State of Tennessee, \$50,000.

"State of New York, on Long Island, \$50,000.

"State of Colorado, \$50,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BENNET. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 64.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, is the question on the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. Those in favor of the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] to recommit will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 53, nays 305, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

YEAS—53.

Austin	Carter, Mass.	Danforth	Gregg
Bennet	Chandler, N. Y.	Dempsey	Hamilton, N. Y.
Booner	Charles	Eagan	Hicks
Byrnes, Tenn.	Chipperfield	Farley	Houston
Caldwell	Coleman	Fitzgerald	Hulbert
Cannon	Conry	Gallivan	Humphreys, Miss.

Husted	Miller, Minn.	Platt	Ward
Kettner	Moon	Pratt	Watson, Va.
Langley	Moore, Ind.	Riordan	Wilson, Ill.
London	Morrison	Rowe	Winslow
McDermott	Mott	Siegel	Woods, Iowa
McKellar	Oglesby	Smith, N. Y.	
Magee	Padgett	Snyder	
Maher	Parker, N. Y.	Tague	

NAYS—305.

Abercrombie	Emerson	King	Rouse
Adair	Esch	Kinkaid	Rubey
Adamson	Estopinal	Kitchin	Rucker
Alexander	Evans	Konop	Russell, Mo.
Allen	Farr	La Follette	Russell, Ohio.
Almon	Ferris	Lazaro	Sabath
Anderson	Fess	Lee	Saunders
Anthony	Fields	Lehlbach	Schall
Ashbrook	Flood	Lenroot	Scott, Mich.
Aswell	Fordney	Leshar	Sears
Bailey	Foss	Lever	Sells
Barkley	Poster	Lieb	Shallenberger
Barrhart	Frear	Lindbergh	Sherley
Bell	Frcman	Linthicum	Sherwood
Black	Fuller	Lloyd	Sims
Blackmon	Gallagher	Lobeck	Sinnott
Borland	Gard	Longworth	Sisson
Bowers	Garland	Loud	Slayden
Britt	Garner	McAndrews	Sloan
Britten	Garrett	McArthur	Small
Browne	Gillett	McClintic	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Glynn	McCracken	Smith, Mich.
Buchanan, Ill.	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan, Tex.	Good	McFadden	Sparkman
Burgess	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Stafford
Burnett	Gordon	McLaughlin	Staggall
Butler	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray, Ind.	Madden	Steele, Iowa
Callaway	Gray, N. J.	Mann	Steele, Pa.
Campbell	Green, Iowa	Mapes	Steenerson
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Martin	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	Matthews	Stephens, Tex.
Capstick	Griest	Mays	Sterling
Caraway	Hadley	Meeker	Stiness
Carlin	Hamilton, Mich.	Miller, Del.	Stone
Carter, Okla.	Hamlin	Mondell	Stout
Casey	Hardy	Montague	Sulloway
Church	Harrison, Miss.	Moore, Pa.	Summers
Clark, Fla.	Harrison, Va.	Morgan, Okla.	Sutherland
Cline	Hastings	Morin	Sweet
Coady	Haugen	Mudd	Switzer
Collier	Hawley	Neely	Taggart
Connelly	Hayden	Nelson	Talbott
Cooper, Ohio	Hefflin	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, W. Va.	Helgesen	Nichols, Mich.	Temple
Cooper, Wis.	Helm	North	Thomas
Crago	Helvering	Norton	Thompson
Cramton	Henry	Oakey	Tillman
Crisp	Hernandez	Oldfield	Tilson
Crosser	Hill	Oliver	Timberlake
Curry	Hilliard	Olney	Tinkham
Dale, Vt.	Holland	O'Shaunessy	Towner
Dallinger	Hollingsworth	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Davenport	Hood	Page, N. C.	Venable
Davis, Minn.	Hopwood	Palge, Mass.	Vinson
Davis, Tex.	Howard	Park	Volstead
Decker	Howell	Parker, N. J.	Walker
Denison	Huddleston	Peters	Walsh
Dent	Hughes	Phelan	Wason
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Porter	Watkins
Dickinson	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	Watson, Pa.
Dies	Humphrey, Wash.	Powers	Webb
Dill	Igoe	Quin	Whaley
Dillon	Jacoway	Ragsdale	Wheeler
Dixon	James	Rainey	Williams, T. S.
Doolittle	Johnson, Ky.	Raker	Williams, W. E.
Doremus	Johnson, Wash.	Ramseyer	Williams, Ohio
Doughton	Jones	Randall	Wilson, La.
Dowell	Kahn	Rauch	Wingo
Drukker	Kearns	Rayburn	Wise
Dunn	Keating	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Dupré	Keister	Reilly	Woodyard
Dyer	Kelley	Ricketts	Young, N. Dak.
Eagle	Kennedy, Iowa	Roberts, Mass.	Young, Tex.
Edwards	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts, Nev.	
Elston	Kent	Rodenberg	
	Kincheloe	Rogers	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

McKinley

NOT VOTING—75.

Aiken	Edmonds	Hinds	Price
Ayres	Ellsworth	Hutchinson	Rowland
Bacharach	Fairchild	Johnson, S. Dak.	Sanford
Barchfeld	Finley	Key, Ohio	Scott, Pa.
Beakes	Flynn	Kless, Pa.	Scully
Beakes	Fecht	Kreider	Shackelford
Benedict	Gandy	Lafean	Shouse
Bruckner	Gardner	Lewis	Slemp
Brumbaugh	Glass	Liebel	Smith, Minn.
Burke	Gould	Littlepage	Snell
Carew	Graham	Loft	Stephens, Miss.
Cary	Griffin	McGillicuddy	Swift
Copley	Guernsey	Miller, Pa.	Tavener
Costello	Hamill	Moorey	Taylor, Ark.
Cullop	Hart	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Dale, N. Y.	Haskell	Moss	Tribble
Darrow	Hayes	Murray	Vare
Dooling	Heaton	Nolan	Wilson, Fla.
Driscoll	Hensley	Patten	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. NOLAN.
Mr. MOSS with Mr. BARCHFELD.
Mr. BEAKES with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. BEALES.
Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. BENEDICT.
Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. KREIDER.
Mr. LOFT with Mr. CARY.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. CAREW with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. COSTELLO.
Mr. CULLOP with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. DARROW.
Mr. DOOLING with Mr. HINDS.
Mr. HART with Mr. EDMONDS.
Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. HEATON.
Mr. HAMILL with Mr. ELLSWORTH.
Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HAYES.
Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. GANDY with Mr. GUERNSEY.
Mr. GLASS with Mr. FOCHT.
Mr. PRICE with Mr. GRAHAM.
Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. ROWLAND.
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. GOULD.
Mr. TRIBBLE with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. VARE.
Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. SNELL.
Mr. TAVENNER with Mr. TREADWAY.
Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. LAFEAN.
Mr. MURRAY with Mr. BACHARACH.
Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. SLEMP.
Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. HASKELL.
Mr. AYRES with Mr. SWIFT.
Mr. FINLEY with Mr. SANFORD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The motion to recommit is lost. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Department of Labor to make an inquiry into the cost of living in the District of Columbia and to report thereon to Congress as early as practicable.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. THOMPSON, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Julia A. Slaybaugh, H. R. 6474, Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—ANNUAL REPORT, GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL (H. DOC. NO. 1498).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 7, 1916.

FISH-CULTURAL STATIONS IN CERTAIN STATES.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. This is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 159, answered "present" 2, not voting 84, as follows:

YEAS—189.

Abercrombie	Dupré	Lazaro	Rubey
Adamson	Dyer	Lesher	Rucker
Alexander	Eagan	Lever	Russell, Mo.
Allen	Eagle	Lieb	Sabath
Almon	Edwards	Liebel	Saunders
Aswell	Farr	Linthicum	Schall
Austin	Ferris	Lloyd	Scott, Mich.
Bailey	Fordney	Lobeck	Sears
Barnhart	Fuller	London	Shallenberger
Bell	Gallagher	Loud	Sherwood
Black	Gard	McAndrews	Sinnott
Blackmon	Garner	McArthur	Slayden
Boohar	Godwin, N. C.	McClintic	Small
Borland	Goodwin, Ark.	McCracken	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Gray, Ala.	McDermott	Smith, Mich.
Britt	Greene, Mass.	McKinley	Smith, Minn.
Browning	Gregg	McLaughlin	Smith, Tex.
Buchanan, Ill.	Hadley	McLemore	Sparkman
Burgess	Hamilton, Mich.	Magee	Steagall
Byrnes, S. C.	Hamlin	Martin	Stedman
Callaway	Hardy	Mays	Steenerson
Capstick	Harrison, Va.	Miller, Del.	Stephens, Tex.
Carlin	Hastings	Miller, Minn.	Stiness
Carter, Okla.	Hayden	Mondell	Stone
Casey	Heflin	Moore, Pa.	Summers
Church	Henry	Morgan, Okla.	Sutherland
Clark, Fla.	Hernandez	Nicholls, S. C.	Tague
Cline	Hilliard	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Colo.
Coady	Holland	Oakey	Thompson
Coleman	Hollingsworth	Oldfield	Tillman
Collier	Hood	Oliver	Van Dyke
Cooper, Ohio	Howard	O'Shaunessy	Vinson
Cooper, W. Va.	Howell	Overmyer	Volstead
Cooper, Wis.	Huddleston	Page, N. C.	Walker
Crago	Hughes	Park, N. C.	Watkins
Crisp	Humphrey, Wash.	Porter	Watson, Pa.
Cullop	Humphreys, Miss.	Pou	Watson, Va.
Curry	Igoe	Quin	Whaley
Davenport	Jacoway	Ragsdale	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Rainey	Wilson, La.
Davis, Tex.	Kearns	Raker	Wingo
Decker	Kennedy, R. I.	Randall	Wise
Dent	Kettner	Rauch	Woodyard
Dewalt	King	Rosenberg	Young, N. Dak.
Dickinson	Kitchin	Rowe	Young, Tex.
Dill	La Follette		
Doughton			

NAYS—159.

Adair	Farley	Kincheloe	Roberts, Mass.
Anderson	Fess	Kinkaid	Roberts, Nev.
Anthony	Fields	Konop	Rogers
Ashbrook	Fitzgerald	Langley	Russell, Ohio
Barkley	Foss	Lehbach	Sells
Bennet	Foster	Lenroot	Sherley
Britten	Frear	Lindbergh	Siegel
Browne	Freeman	Longworth	Sims
Buchanan, Tex.	Gallivan	McCulloch	Sisson
Butler	Garland	McPadden	Sloan
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett	McKellar	Snyder
Caldwell	Gillett	McKenzie	Stafford
Campbell	Glass	Madden	Steele, Iowa
Candler, Miss.	Glynn	Mann	Steele, Pa.
Cannon	Good	Mapes	Stephens, Nebr.
Carter, Mass.	Gordon	Mathews	Sterling
Chandler, N. Y.	Gray, Ind.	Meeker	Stout
Charles	Gray, N. J.	Montague	Suloway
Chislerfield	Green, Iowa	Moon	Sweet
Connelly	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Conry	Griest	Morrison	Taggart
Cox	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Temple
Cramton	Haugen	Mudd	Thomas
Crosser	Helgesen	Nelson	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Helm	North	Timberlake
Dallinger	Helvering	Oglesby	Tinkham
Danforth	Hicks	Padgett	Towner
Dempsey	Hill	Paige, Mass.	Treadway
Denison	Hopwood	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Dies	Hulbert	Parker, N. Y.	Ward
Dillon	Hull, Iowa	Peters	Wason
Dixon	Hull, Tenn.	Phelan	Webb
Doolittle	Husted	Platt	Williams, T. S.
Dowell	James	Powers	Williams, W. E.
Drukker	Johnson, Ky.	Pratt	Williams, Ohio
Dunn	Keating	Ramseyer	Wilson, Ill.
Elston	Keister	Rayburn	Winslow
Emerson	Kelley	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Relly	Woods, Iowa
Evans	Kent	Ricketts	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Flood Houston

NOT VOTING—84.

Aiken	Cary	Flynn	Heaton
Ayres	Copley	Focht	Hensley
Bacharach	Costello	Gandy	Hinds
Barchfeld	Dale, N. Y.	Gardner	Hutchinson
Beakes	Darrow	Gould	Johnson, S. Dak.
Beales	Doering	Graham	Jones
Benedict	Doremus	Griffin	Key, Ohio
Bruckner	Driscoll	Guernsey	Kieess, Pa.
Brumbaugh	Edmonds	Hamill	Kreider
Burke	Ellsworth	Harrison, Miss.	Lafean
Cantrill	Estopinal	Hart	Lee
Caraway	Fairchild	Haskell	Lewis
Carew	Finley	Hayes	Littlepage

Left	Murray	Scott, Pa.	Swift
McGillcuddy	Nolan	Scully	Talbot
Maher	Norton	Shackelford	Tavener
Miller, Pa.	Patten	Shouse	Taylor, Ark.
Mooney	Price	Slemp	Tribble
Morgan, La.	Riordan	Smith, N. Y.	Vare
Morin	Rowland	Snell	Venable
Moss	Sanford	Stephens, Miss.	Wilson, Fla.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. VENABLE with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. SNELL.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. BENEDICT.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. HAYDEN with Mr. BEALES.

Mr. LEE with Mr. NOLAN.

Mr. JONES with Mr. ELLSWORTH.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. BARCHFELD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. RAKER. Reserving the right to object, the title should be amended.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The title should be amended to include the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the title will be amended as indicated by the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. ALEXANDER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT ELECT.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, there is a Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) on the Speaker's table. It provides for the appointment of a committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inaugural ceremonies. Perhaps that resolution might as well be disposed of now as at any time, and I ask the Speaker to lay the resolution before the House.

The SPEAKER. It requires unanimous consent.

Mr. GARRETT. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, and that the House now consider, Senate concurrent resolution 27.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate concurrent resolution 27, about the inauguration. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let it be reported first.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That a joint committee, consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President elect of the United States on the 5th day of March next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Messrs. RUCKER, GARRETT, and MCKINLEY.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Saturday next House bill 11250, known as the vocational educational bill, shall be in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the clearing up of the business on the Speaker's table, the vocational education bill (H. R. 11250) be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Under the request which the gentleman makes, if the bill is not disposed of on Saturday it will not be privileged after that. I think if we take up that bill we ought to take it

up in such a way that it will be finally disposed of, and I suggest to the gentleman that he request that the bill be made privileged, subject to appropriation bills.

Mr. KITCHIN. I was about to ask that it be made privileged, subject to the right of way of appropriation bills.

Mr. MANN. And other privileged matters.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that beginning with Saturday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, the vocational education bill be made a privileged bill, not to interfere with appropriation bills.

Mr. KITCHIN. And other privileged bills.

The SPEAKER. And things of that sort.

Mr. MANN. And other privileged days.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Just to give it a privileged status. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL SATURDAY NEXT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Reserving the right to object, what effect will that have on the rights of the Committee on Invalid Pensions? That committee has a bill ready to act upon to-morrow, which is the regular day.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. We can not take it up to-morrow if the House adjourns.

Mr. KITCHIN. We can make the arrangement we have made heretofore for unanimous consent, that on Saturday after 5 o'clock, or after 6 o'clock, we can consider pension bills.

Mr. MANN. Why not now provide by unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider that bill on Saturday?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will ask unanimous consent that that bill—the pension bill—be in order on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on Saturday it be in order to consider the pension bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, has the other request been granted, that we adjourn until Saturday?

The SPEAKER. No; it has not.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to ask what effect that will have upon the meeting of our committee to-morrow? That will not affect the legality of the meeting of our committee, will it?

The SPEAKER. Why, no. You have got the right to meet any day in the year.

Mr. MANN. You can meet at midnight if you can get the members of the committee together.

Mr. ADAMSON. We will get in an all-day meeting, then, if we can get away from this wrangle here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] proposes to object, unless his pension bill can be considered.

Mr. MANN. That is in the request.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I understand that the gentleman from North Carolina includes in his request that the pension bill be in order on Saturday.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that that be disposed of before we take up the vocational education bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on Saturday next, the first thing after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, the pension bill shall be called up and disposed of, and that following that the vocational education bill be a matter of privilege.

Mr. MANN. And that when we adjourn to-day we adjourn to meet on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Yes; and that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOOD.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of House resolution 389, directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to the House of Representatives the facts relating to the production, marketing, and distribution of food products in the United States, together with any violations of the antitrust laws in connection therewith, and recommendations for greater economy and effi-

ciency in the marketing of food products and the punishment and prevention of extortion in the prices thereof.

This resolution was sent by the Speaker to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The fact is that it is on a subject which has been before the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee have had hearings on it, and this is the amplification of the resolution upon which the Judiciary Committee have had hearings. Therefore I ask a change of reference to the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 389, and that the same be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. I rise to reserve the right to object, in order to make an observation.

I do not see why a resolution referred to the appropriate committee through inadvertence or otherwise should be changed. This resolution plainly and evidently deals with matters under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; it deals with an investigation that that committee has the authority to order. The fact that they have stated in their bill something about the antitrust law does not divest the committee of its fundamental jurisdiction. It may be that in conducting an investigation our committee might unearth something about the antitrust law and in its investigations as to the trade conditions in beef. While I am not going to interfere with the liberal construction of the administration of the Speaker in being good to all the committees that do not have much of anything to do, I shall protest, at least formally, against being divested of jurisdiction which properly belongs to a committee which can and does do business. [Laughter.] I shall leave it to the Speaker and shall not raise any row about it, but I will not agree that a resolution which belongs to our committee shall be taken away.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I should be glad to have the resolution remain with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but after all this is a supplemental resolution. There are a lot, I do not know how many, about 15 or 20, kindred resolutions from different sources which have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and this is simply a supplemental resolution, and in the orderly procedure of business it ought to go to that committee without affecting the question of jurisdiction between the committees.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman from Missouri will state that the purpose of the investigation is to ascertain violations of the antitrust law I will waive any objections I may have.

Mr. BORLAND. I am much obliged to the gentleman for the courtesy, because we had no intention to take it away from his committee, but simply to follow up the work already done by the other committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair inadvertently sent this to the committee presided over by the gentleman from Georgia, and the Chair has stated a dozen times that that committee has a lot of work to do and does a lot of work. The rest of these bills have been sent to the Judiciary Committee. The House can do as it pleases. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if this is the resolution known as the beef-trust resolution?

Mr. BORLAND. It is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And was before the Judiciary Committee at the last session?

Mr. BORLAND. The original resolution was before the committee at the last session, not this resolution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What progress was made by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. BORLAND. There were extensive hearings, occupying 10 or 12 days in all, and the printed copies of the hearings are in existence.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The purpose of this resolution is to inquire into the high cost of living, the price of beef and meats generally.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has not the Attorney General announced a purpose of making an inquiry of this kind?

Mr. BORLAND. I think he has; I hope he has; but that would not obviate the work done here.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like to say that the question of the price of meats in the large cities is an aggravated one. We waited patiently all of last session to have some action taken on these resolutions. No action appears to have been taken. Now, if we are to fall again between the three stools—the Attorney General, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Committee on the Judiciary—we might as well have an understanding now when this question of unanimous consent is asked. Does the gentleman think he is going to get any action on the high cost of living if this resolution is referred to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. BORLAND. I do.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the regular order, and the regular order is, Is there objection to this change of reference?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I merely want to say—

Mr. SHERLEY. I demand the regular order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Evidently the gentleman does not want action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ADAMSON. I shall not object on the statement of the gentleman from Missouri that the purpose is to investigate violations of the antitrust law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] may address the House for one hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] may address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMSON. For the purpose of asking a question, I reserve the right to object, and for that purpose only. Is it the intention to transact any other business in the House to-day?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; we will adjourn after the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin if consent is granted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] be permitted to address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I again submit my request for unanimous consent for change of reference on House resolution 389 from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of this is to discover violations of the antitrust law.

The SPEAKER. Is this the same matter the gentleman had up a moment ago?

Mr. BORLAND. It is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] asks unanimous consent to rerefer House resolution 389 from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is recognized for one hour.

PUBLIC BUILDING WASTE REACHES MANY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS EVERY YEAR—EIGHTY PER CENT OF THE PROPOSED 1916 ITEMS IS WASTE, ACCORDING TO TREASURY DEPARTMENT COMPUTATIONS—IT IS A "PORK-BARREL" BILL, IN DEGREE FULLY AS BAD AS THE AVERAGE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL—THE LAST PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL WAS PASSED BY THE HOUSE WITH 20 MINUTES' DEBATE—THIS BILL CARRIES \$35,000,000 AND SHOULD BE DEFEATED.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed within a half hour an omnibus bill by a vote of 188 to 159 appropriating nearly \$900,000 for 18 fish hatcheries scattered from Alabama to Washington, in addition to 40 now established. The House probably noticed that some of the distinguished Members on the Democratic side, including the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], voted against that omnibus bill, which proposed to establish fish hatcheries throughout the country. Yesterday there was given to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury a report in which he vigorously criticised the omnibus public buildings bill calling for \$35,000,000, and gave reasons why, in his judgment, that bill ought to be defeated. Yesterday, also, the distinguished Vice President of the United States, Mr. MAR-

SHALL, in welcoming a body of men known as the River and Harbor Congress, which is a lobby organized for the purpose of urging the passage of river and harbor bills, also recommended a change in the method of appropriations from omnibus bills to specific legislation. The protest against "pork barrels" is in the air, and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss briefly the subject of public buildings bills, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONRY). The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I speak in opposition to the pending \$35,000,000 public-buildings bill, which we are told will pass at this session. Judging from past experience the bill will be loaded down at the other end of the Capitol with from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 more "Government monuments," so that it promises to rival the \$43,000,000 river and harbor pork barrel passed at this same session of Congress. The last public-buildings act was rushed through the House under suspension of the rules. Only 20 minutes were given the opponents of the bill in which to discuss a bill of 50 pages, containing between 400 and 500 items, appropriating over \$40,000,000, and covering extravagant and worthless projects from one end of the country to the other. The House and the public were blindfolded as to facts, and then bound and gagged by a vote of 154 to 30 to stifle discussion. Those who would know the record will find it beginning on pages 3299 and 4245 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-second Congress.

Protests upon protests against the bill and its method of passage will there be found in the few minutes then permitted for discussion.

There will be found the denunciation of Mr. FITZGERALD, of New York, chairman of the appropriations bill, who said:

I denounce as indefensible this method of passing a public building bill. * * * It can not be defended from any standpoint of public necessity.

Of the 32 most important chairmanships of House committees, Mr. FITZGERALD is the only chairman from any Northern State, and as the Northern States pay nearly 95 per cent of the revenues with which this Government is being run, and from which appropriations are made, his remarks are of exceptional weight.

AN AUDACIOUS RAID ON THE TREASURY.

A leading Democratic Senator said of the 1913 public-buildings bill it was "the boldest and most audacious raid on the Public Treasury that has been attempted in recent years." The same judgment may be passed on the 1916 bill now before the House.

When the 1913 measure was returned with Senate amendments, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], in charge of the bill, said:

I desire merely to state that there are a number of Senate amendments; there are some of them perhaps that are good and many of them no doubt are bad.

The record, however, fails to show that any of the many bad ones put in by the House or Senate were omitted.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] said on the same day, February 27, 1913:

The bill contains perhaps less than a score of items that can be attacked on any ground of just criticism out in the country, but contains nearly \$10,000,000 hoghead of pork for the District of Columbia. We are compelled to submit to this unjust criticism from one end of the country to the other of having prepared a pork-barrel bill, when there is not a Member of this House that has got more than a slice of side meat compared with this hoghead of pork (Senate amendments). I am disgusted with this high-handed attempt to not only get the lion's share of the pork, but to load all the odium upon the House of Representatives.

This suggests a new odium movie tragedy entitled "Who gets the most pork, or when is an egg too bad to use?"

On a second motion to suspend rules and demand immediate conference, the opposition to the bill was snowed under—164 to 26 (p. 4247). A record vote of 104 majority was cast against instructing the conferees to urge an amendment to limit buildings to offices having more than \$10,000 annual receipts. No restrictions in pork getting were favored.

Without debate or investigation, amid cries, shown by the RECORD, of "Vote!" "Vote!" on page 4245, which significantly sounds like "Pork!" "Pork!" the bill was passed without a roll call. Before the 1916 bill is reached on the calendar, and before the House is again blindfolded, bound, and gagged on the new \$35,000,000 public-buildings bill, which may eventually reach over \$40,000,000, I desire to place before you some facts to show the legislative scandal that will be involved through stifling investigation and debate on this bill and by its passage.

PROFLIGATE WASTE.

In its Democratic national platform, adopted at Baltimore, the party now in power said:

We denounce the profligate waste of money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses which have kept taxes high. * * * We demand a return to that simplicity which befits a democratic Government.

Chairman FITZGERALD, in debate last session, declared of his own party associates:

They have unnecessarily piled up public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming the laughingstock of the country.

In the same speech he referred to "this band of Treasury looters."

Many like statements have been heard from the other side of the aisle by way of confession, and the words of Representative Sisson, of Mississippi, were to the same effect when he said to the House:

I must apologize to you Republicans for having ever used the words "criminally extravagant" in criticizing the appropriations that you made, for if that expression "criminally extravagant" was proper to apply to you, my God! the English language has never found an adjective strong enough to apply to Democratic extravagances.

With expert opinions to guide us on past extravagances of this administration, let us consider the new \$35,000,000 bill, which cares for the interests of 300 or more separate congressional districts with over 400 items, and binds, gags, and blindfolds Congress when it is passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, two public omnibus legislative scandals have been fastened on Congress recently. Two scandals that find supporters but few apologists. From insignificant weaklings they have grown to mighty giants until through allotment of political pelf, they now seek to govern other important legislation.

Both omnibus bills are founded on private greed and local selfishness. They permeate political and legislative activities and encourage the belief among shortsighted constituencies that the relative value of a Representative's service is determined by his ability to obtain appropriations for his constituency. Legitimate public improvements throughout the country, therefore, are required to support these omnibus bills, covering, as they do, scandalous treasury hauls which during the last two decades have jumped from lilliputian size to scores of millions in bills reeking with profligate waste.

Heretofore I have endeavored, although possibly too briefly, to discuss and expose several river and harbor extravagances and the Mississippi River \$16,000,000 land reclamation bill, in an effort to arouse sentiment against such notorious raids on the Federal Treasury. I herewith offer a brief analysis of the public buildings legislative atrocity, which also has served to make Congress a laughingstock throughout the country. For scientific distribution of political pork it has no parallel, as may be easily demonstrated.

PORK BARRELS MUST BE ABANDONED.

Other members are better able to perform this service and I do not expect to offer any thoroughgoing analysis of either the 1913 or 1916 bills. I desire, however, to present a few facts that must soon convince intelligent men that public-buildings bills and river and harbor bills are largely political grab measures, wasteful and indefensible in character, and measures that should be abandoned if we would maintain our self-respect individually and collectively.

For those who have not time nor inclination to investigate the facts, but who wish to get a general understanding of public-buildings bills and their methods of preparation, I have collated a few facts taken from official sources which may be of use in determining what should be done with the 1916 bill.

An agreed state of facts and the opinions of experts will first be submitted to show that the average public-buildings bill, including the bill under discussion, is indefensible and vicious in principle. Some intelligent, businesslike system of determining the location and character of public buildings should be submitted in lieu of the shameful methods which characterize every public-buildings bill.

Taxpayers overburdened with public-building, land-reclamation, and waterway pork barrels, amounting in the aggregate to over \$100,000,000 during the year 1916, have right to rebel. The 1916 river and harbor bill amounted to \$42,886,000, the so-called flood-control and land-reclamation bills to \$50,600,000, and the 1916 public-buildings bill already reaches \$35,000,000. Over one-half of that total, it can be demonstrated, is to be wasted on useless, extravagant, or private projects and will be improperly drawn from the Public Treasury by three omnibus bills

during this session of Congress, with other equally extravagant bills to follow.

A public-buildings act was passed and approved March 4, 1913, which provided for a Public Buildings Commission. That commission consisted of W. G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury; J. C. Reynolds, Attorney General; A. S. Burleson, Postmaster General; Senators C. A. SWANSON and GEORGE SUTHERLAND, and Representatives FRANK CLARK and R. W. AUSTIN.

THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION'S REPORT.

The commission's report is found in House Document No. 936, Sixty-third Congress. I call attention to several statements therein, to wit:

In 12 years \$163,085,431 has been authorized for public buildings. The act of 1913 authorized \$41,797,350, or over 25 per cent of the total. On January 1, 1914, 864 buildings had been completed, 120 more were in course of construction, 310 more authorized on sites not built, and 183 more authorized sites for buildings had not been purchased. The Architect's Office is able to prepare for about 75 buildings annually, and, according to information received, that office has not yet caught up with the demands of hungry constituencies, as set forth in the figures cited.

Another significant fact is disclosed. The average annual operating cost for 438 post offices, including heat, light, and so forth, is \$2,594. Buildings costing \$75,000 averaged \$2,320, and buildings costing \$50,000 averaged \$1,815 annually. To this cost should be added 3 per cent annual interest on the investment, which makes the annual cost to the Government on \$50,000 buildings \$3,315 and on \$75,000 buildings \$4,570. To this total must also be added depreciation charges of approximately 3 to 5 per cent annually, to include repairs. These figures should be kept in mind when ascertaining the profligate waste piled up by these bills.

The highest rental paid by the Government to any one of the 508 post offices having over \$10,000 annual receipts and occupying leased quarters is \$2,580, and the lowest rental \$151 annually. At 378 offices the rental is less than \$1,000, and at 130 offices the rental exceeds \$1,000. For 4,320 post offices of all classes and branches the average annual rental in 1913 was \$824.

In other words, it now costs the Government annually about \$824 on the average to rent offices which will cost over \$3,315 annually when \$50,000 buildings are erected, and \$4,570 when the cost reaches \$75,000 for building and site. Other costs, present and prospective, will be set forth more in detail when specific items are discussed.

No hasty conclusions should be reached as to necessity for "public monuments" in Jim Crow towns or jerkwater stations until the provisions of the 1913 law are first examined. An analysis of the last public-buildings act passed by Congress shows conclusively just how dishonest and wasteful these bills have become.

A HIGH-CLASS COMMISSION.

Before discussing that law I quote from the commission's report signed by Messrs. McAdoo, Swanson, Sutherland, Clark, and Austin. It recommends that no public building be authorized where annual receipts are less than \$10,000 per year, and in the consideration of each project "a comparison of rental value for suitable quarters, together with cost of maintenance and operation, including interest at 3 per cent on the investment for the building proposed shall be made in order that it may be determined whether its erection would be a desirable or proper investment." Again the majority of the commission reported "A general examination of sites and buildings authorized but not consummated has been made, and the commission is satisfied that some appropriations and authorizations have been made which are not justified. Other authorizations are too large." This is a positive indictment of past public-buildings bills and of Congress, made by reputable and responsible authority.

Chairman CLARK, of the committee and a member of the commission, signed that report. Thereafter Postmaster General Burleson ripped the cover from off the 1913 public-building pork barrel in a minority report which for comprehensive detail could not be surpassed. Page after page of concrete facts are given in Document No. 936, of last session, wherein the whole miserable system is disclosed, not by argument, but by incontrovertible statistics.

Mr. Burleson served his apprenticeship in the House and afterwards undertook the administration of the department for which we are providing public buildings. His judgment of locality requirements ought to be that of manager of a great commercial business. He tells us what is needed, but in order to help local constituencies and boost political fortunes the

directors of the company—Congress—insists on establishing buildings at hundreds of country cross roads for political purposes rather than public necessity, notwithstanding this protest of the business manager, chosen by the people.

In his minority report, pages 28 and 29, Mr. Burleson, presumably the best-informed member of the Public Building Commission, says:

That a public building for post-office purposes only be not authorized for any place unless the rental paid for Government offices is as much as \$1,000 per annum, and then only when either the gross post-office receipts amount to as much as \$15,000, or the population to as much as 5,000.

From a brief examination of the 1913 bill this would have barred over 80 per cent of the four hundred and odd projects contained in that bursting pork barrel, and, according to Mr. Burleson's conclusions, that bill was four-fifths waste when measured by items. By the same token over 80 per cent of items in the 1916 bill would be properly rejected apart from extensions and increases.

Again, Mr. Burleson says in his report—

2. That whenever public buildings are authorized quarters be provided, if possible, for all permanent Government offices, but that no provision be made for any branch of the service that will not have real need of accommodations on at least one day of each month, except in the case of United States courts.

3. That United States court accommodations be provided only at places where court has actually been in session on at least 10 days of the preceding year.

Just why 10 days instead of 30 days or more was named is hard to say. Surely he is liberal in his estimates of public necessity.

DESERTED FEDERAL COURTHOUSES.

Yet if the provision recommended by Mr. Burleson had been pursued in the past, about one-half of our magnificent deserted Federal courthouses would not have been built and many millions of dollars would not have been frittered away on extravagant empty buildings—monuments to our own business incapacity. Again, he says—

7. That the practice of authorizing sites in advance of authorizations for buildings be discontinued, and that authorizations for buildings and sites be made simultaneously.

Why not, except to wrongfully encourage a dribbling, unbusinesslike system?

Providing this common-sense plan had been followed, instead of public grab methods, 130 sites contained in the 1913 bill would have been omitted, but these items pulled votes for the bill, and practically the same number of sites in the 1916 bill are relied on to furnish 100 more votes for the measure now before us.

Mr. Burleson says further in his report to Congress:

20. That a lump-sum appropriation of \$10,000,000 be made annually for public buildings work.

This would be more economical, but would not affect the vicious system, without other changes made in present methods.

As the amount appropriated from 1906 to 1913, inclusive, for public buildings reached about \$130,000,000, or nearly double the average amount recommended by Postmaster General Burleson, one effect of his proposal will be readily appreciated. It tends toward needful economy.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. May I ask the gentleman whether it is not a rule of the committee not to consider an appropriation for any location unless the receipts of the particular place where it is proposed to construct a public building are in excess of \$10,000?

Mr. FREAR. No; it is not a rule. It is said to be a rule, but by the time the gentleman has seen the statistics which I shall submit in respect to the 1916 bill, he will observe that it is a rule which is honored by its nonobservance from beginning to end.

Mr. FOCHT. I trust the gentleman will develop that.

Mr. FREAR. I shall certainly demonstrate it to the satisfaction of the House with many items that will be submitted. I say any number. I would say offhand 100 or more of the projects contained in this bill. In one case of nine projects from one State not a single one of the projects reaches that amount of receipts.

Mr. FOCHT. I asked the question for the reason that in several instances where I have applied for an appropriation the first consideration was whether there were receipts exceeding \$10,000, and I was led to believe that the committee would not consider the matter unless that amount was received.

Mr. FREAR. I readily understand that that has been the position assumed by the committee but not observed. Let me

suggest as an evidence of the action of the House upon that particular proposition that when an amendment was urged as a part of the 1913 bill to limit the construction to places where the receipts amounted to \$10,000 it was defeated in the House by nearly 100 majority. I stated that a few moments ago. I propose to offer a tentative bill suggesting a system that will, if adopted, remove all of these objections.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman is not opposed to a public building where the necessity of the case demands it?

Mr. FREAR. No; certainly not.

Mr. FOCHT. Or where the receipts are \$10,000?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, yes, indeed. I propose to show here that Mr. Burleson said that the limit ought to be \$15,000, and the Treasury Department insists that it ought to be \$25,000. The question of the amount of money taken in at a particular office, in so far as the construction of a building is concerned at that point, has no more relation to it than has the amount of money taken in by a street car conductor with the cost of the car that he is running. That will be readily observed when it is realized that this money is for the purpose of carrying the mail, and that we are carrying on our Post Office Department not at a profit but at a loss. I shall submit in my statement cases showing the increased expense will be three to ten times the amount now paid by the Government for local rents and other charges, according to the estimates of the Treasury Department.

Mr. FOCHT. I have always understood the conception to be that these appropriations are made for the accommodation of the public, and hence that it is the best kind of appropriation, if properly applied, that could be made by Congress. In fact, about the only thing that the people get with any directness is the delivery of the mail and the dispatch of their business; and if there is a community of sufficient commercial importance and population to require such a building I would like to ask the gentleman whether he is opposed to it?

Mr. FREAR. Let me ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what he believes is the proper standard?

Mr. FOCHT. I think that is the standard—the importance of the community and the requirements and the public demand for the dispatch of business.

Mr. FREAR. True; and of these 400 items that have been placed in the 1916 bill there is not a single item which has not been inserted by that very argument, dependent upon the locality itself, dependent upon the political pull that is possessed, as to whether the proposition is sufficient. Who is going to determine it? Not the Treasury Department, not the Post Office Department, but a committee which does not observe any rule of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. FOCHT. Congress is supposed to determine the question, and as far as the gentleman's constant quoting of Mr. Burleson, I should prefer to have his own opinion as a Member of Congress.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the gentleman. The reason I have quoted Mr. Burleson so frequently is this: He was an able member of that commission. He made a statement based upon a very careful investigation of all the facts, that \$15,000 ought to be the limit, the minimum. I can not conceive of any limitation of that kind having any bearing upon what the cost of the building should be. It would seem to me that the recommendation should come through the Treasury Department or the Post Office Department, depending upon the necessity of a particular community, and in such a case, just as with the river and harbor bill or any other bill, that ought to be the determining factor.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman's theory is to get away from the pork-barrel feature—

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. And the local political pull it gives Congressmen. I thoroughly agree that the building should be based upon the public necessity. We must stand on that.

Mr. FREAR. I know the gentleman does. I am offering this statement in order to make clear where we have been led in past legislation.

Mr. FOCHT. I think the gentleman is performing a great public service if he can confine the construction of post-office buildings to communities where necessity alone demands them.

Mr. FREAR. I wish it were more generally believed in by Members of the House.

Returning to the Public Building Commission's report:

Other recommendations seeking to halt or slacken the race for local public-building gifts and grafts appear in the minority report, which covers 100 pages and blasts the present system with a broadside of statistics.

In this discussion it is needless to say I have no interest in what congressional districts are affected or who introduces the

bills acted upon by the committee. I do not presume to criticize individual Members for introducing bills under local pressure, nor am I interested in the acts of the committee, excepting in so far as such acts serve to show the character of the present system which notoriously is affected by political or personal pull and in only a secondary degree by the requirements of communities or needs of the General Government.

I do say that 400 different propositions contained in the 1916 bill scattered all over the country are calculated to enlist the support of enough votes to pass any bill. That is a problem as serious in character as any which confronts this Congress. Will Congress put through this legislative monstrosity, which carries many millions of dollars of wasted public money? I shall endeavor briefly to demonstrate, so that he who runs may read, that the whole bill is charged with "profligate waste," such as was denounced by the Democratic convention at Baltimore and to use a further quotation from that historic but disregarded platform, it is "wrung from the people by oppressive taxation."

LIMITATION BASED ON RECEIPTS IS A SUBTERFUGE.

An effort is made ostensibly to limit items going into the public-building grab bag by requiring local office annual receipts to reach \$10,000. This modest limit was fixed so as to permit thousands of villages to enter the bill, but the limit is regularly brushed aside by the committee, so that the rule has become honored by its notorious nonobservance. In other words, when the annual rental is only \$300 or less a new building costing \$3,000 or more in annual carrying charges may be built whenever receipts reach far less than \$10,000 annually—if the committee so elects.

What business reason exists for a law or rule which has become a political subterfuge? Let us see. The committee says not even \$10,000 annual postage sales and income should be the limit. Burleson says \$15,000 annually, and Treasury officials believe \$25,000 annual receipts should be shown before a public building is authorized. The matter of local receipts as a measure of Government needs has no relation to the subject. The local post office is only a collector, and the collection is made to handle and carry mail to the four quarters of the globe, not to erect public monuments in corner crossroads.

The department is not self-supporting. The question governing any other kind of business, public or private, would relate to necessity, economy, and policy. The omnibus policy is to build wherever votes are needed to carry through the bill. Every excuse is urged for construction—Federal courts and assay offices—and now to aid the civil service. No inventive genius has yet thought of using these "Government monuments" for Army signal stations or Indian blockhouses in our scheme of public defense, but no reason is too absurd to avoid a nonobserved limitation in receipts which in itself is unintelligible from any business standpoint and manifestly absurd in principle.

This assumed limitation is only used to justify a bad legislative policy, as may be demonstrated.

In order to relieve Members of Congress from the necessity of building these scandalous swap bills, and in order to permit them to engage in more legitimate legislative public service, I suggest a business proposition which will save money and time and promote public efficiency. Why not pass a simple measure to cover the following purposes?

A BILL PROVIDING FOR A PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION.

A commission composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General is hereby created whose duty it shall be to receive and investigate all applications for Government public buildings wherever located. The commission may provide rules concerning the size of communities, post-office receipts, and rental paid by the Government in determining where public buildings are to be constructed, and shall determine the character, cost, and plans of every such public building.

The commission shall annually prepare a report of its findings and recommendations and the same shall be embodied in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Postmaster General. The amounts required to provide for the purchase of sites, construction of buildings, and purchase of needed equipment shall be included and made a part of the regular supply bills submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a few facts have been presented heretofore relative to the vicious character of river and harbor legislation, which depends for its existence on votes gathered from different sections of the country by the judicious distribution of cash. The public-buildings bill is equally indefensible. Excuses are offered that Congress grants a maximum amount for buildings, and it is then for Treasury officials to reduce the amount, if need be. That excuse is of the same character as occurs in river and harbor legislation when extravagance and waste is avoided by laying responsibility on Army engineers. Congress makes wasteful and extravagant appropriations for rivers and harbors and public buildings. Congress locates these "improve-

ments." Political pull is then brought to bear on the administration authorities to expend the entire amount, and frequently much more than the first amount granted. The system has resulted in illogical measures that waste a score of millions every year on inland waterways and insignificant harbors and on useless public buildings. A pretense of securing Army engineers' approval is offered with river and harbor projects. No official approval as to necessity occurs with public buildings. It is largely a matter of political pull and local graft. Owners of desirable sites, those interested in change of location, those who want to see Government money spent locally, and various other interests demand their "Government monument."

Such bills will not bear public scrutiny, and a few facts presented show imperatively that a more businesslike, economical, and honest method of providing public buildings must be devised. The money waste is large but of minor importance compared with the corrupt influence which underlies all omnibus money grabs.

Before considering the 1916 bill I desire briefly to discuss the last bill passed by Congress in 1913, and on which much definite data is available. The waste, extravagance, and general character of that last bill as passed by Congress may be better understood from statistics gathered from official reports. In round numbers that bill contained over 400 projects, which, evenly distributed, would have covered nearly every congressional district, irrespective of public needs. These items were widely and generously distributed, as will appear from a perusal of Document No. 936, Sixty-third Congress, so that when presented for passage a large majority of the districts were provided with some building or building site. No roll call could be secured, as appears from the RECORD, which was quoted at the outset.

VILLAGES UNDER 3,000 INHABITANTS.

To show what kind of villages and crossroads were recognized in the 1913 bill, a partial list of places under 3,000 inhabitants is offered where the Government is now paying on the average an annual rental of from \$300 to \$720 per month, yet when the new 1913 public buildings have been erected the average annual cost to the Government will be from five to ten times present expenditures. In other words, that is local pork taken from the Public Treasury in response to clamoring local constituencies. The Postmaster General insists that 280 cities, containing over 5,000 inhabitants each, ought first to be provided with public buildings before any more pork barrels are built, but I am taking a much lower census figure, 3,000, to show the indefensible character of the last public-buildings bill, which did not differ much in general plan from the 1916 bill now urged for passage. Nearly 100 of such items occurred in the 1913 bill alone, of which a few are cited from the commission's report:

The principle governing the distribution of political or local pork in the 1913 bill is found on page 33 of Document 936 when applied to Florida items for illustration:

Location.	Population.	Rentals.	Appropriation.
Bartow, Fla.	2,662	\$650	\$55,000
De Land, Fla.	2,812	600	65,000
Orlando, Fla.	3,812	900	65,000
Apalachicola, Fla.	3,065	600	75,000
Lakeland, Fla.	3,719	1,200	75,000
Marianna, Fla.	1,915	350	70,000
Sanford, Fla.	3,570	600	70,000
De Funiak Springs, Fla.	2,017	100	16,000
Key West, Fla.	19,945	80,000
Kissimmee, Fla.	2,157	380	16,000

¹ Site.

This is not a full list of Florida projects contained in the 1913 bill. Notwithstanding Florida has all its 5,000-population towns already provided according to the report, the above list and several others in the bill show that Florida had some potent influence in getting public funds from the Federal Treasury. Think what joy came to Marianna, with its 1,915 souls, upon learning that a good shepherd had given to its people a \$70,000 monument at \$35 per capita. Think of Kissimmee, with 2,157 souls, now living on a stream dry eight months in the year, but remembered in a recent river and harbor bill with \$43,000 more to insure against prairie fires.

Real estate speculators in De Funiak Springs spent sleepless nights while skirmishing around among its 2,017 inhabitants in a desperate effort to find a vacant building lot for \$6,000 on which to erect their Government monument. And that amount alone would have paid rental for 60 years, or over a half century at present rates, in the Springs.

The little city of Key West gets \$80,000 from Uncle Samuel just to find a lot on which to build. Is that the site secured by

a representative of the Flagler road who haunted the committee before the 1913 bill was reported?

Nine Florida villages above named totaled 25,774 men, women, and children last census, and receive from the good shepherd at Washington nearly a half million dollars to divide among the nine villages. Counting Key West, the allotment reached beyond the half million, and it should be remembered that from other good shepherds Florida gets annually nearly a million dollars more drawn from Federal Treasury vaults for the Kissimmee, the Oklawaha, the Apalachicola, and streams and harbors with liquid names, but often dry banks and bottoms.

OTHER PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN FLORIDA.

The Public Buildings Commission makes an equally astounding statement in its report, pages 94 to 97. From that we learn Florida has 10 Government courthouses containing local post offices which have cost \$1,875,000. California has only 4; Ohio, 5; and Illinois, 6. Florida has 4 Congressmen; California, 11; Ohio, 22; Illinois, 27. Florida has less than 10 per cent of the population of Ohio and Illinois, but 10 courthouses to their 11. In its 1915 fiscal year income-tax payments Florida paid \$229,509; Ohio, \$4,027,459; Illinois, \$5,654,151. Florida furnishes less than 3 per cent of Federal funds compared with these two States, but she coopers the barrel, according to official documents. Later we will discover other remarkable Florida statistics disclosing other interesting facts. At the beginning we learn 10 Government courthouse monuments go to the 4 congressional districts of Florida, also 18 items are in the last 2 public-buildings bills for Florida's 4 districts; ten times the courthouse average that is given to Ohio or to Illinois districts, and yet the Buckeye State contributes practically \$19 for Florida's Government buildings to every dollar paid by Florida, and the Sucker State contributes \$25 for Florida's Government monuments for every dollar paid by Florida, and Florida gets proportionately 10 monuments where Illinois gets 1.

The following covers a few more of the 1913 bill post-office projects which are located in places under 3,000 inhabitants, notwithstanding the Postmaster General insists that no building be placed in cities under 5,000 inhabitants:

Location.	Population.	Appropriation.
Jasper, Ala.	2,509	\$107,500
Arkadelphia, Ark.	2,745	60,000
Fordyce, Ark.	2,704	55,000
Statesboro, Ga.	2,529	57,500
Hiawatha, Kans.	2,974	67,500
Lancaster, Kans.	1,507	60,000

Lancaster lost 133 souls through death or departure from 1900 to 1910, but bleeding Kansas of the last generation apparently bleeds the Treasury of this. Lancaster had less than one-third the population recommended by the Postmaster General for consideration.

Location.	Population.	Appropriation.
Hammond, La.	2,942	\$55,000
Holly Springs, Miss.	2,192	50,000

Holly Springs had an epidemic of removals between 1900 and 1910, during which time it lost 623, or 25 per cent, of its Holly Springs; but Christmas gifts, appropriately wreathed by holly, were dumped by war-tax contributions into the Springs by the congressional Santa Claus.

Location.	Population.	Appropriation.
Aurora, Nebr.	2,630	\$56,000
Chadron, Nebr.	2,687	125,000
Wahoo, Nebr.	2,168	50,000

The Aurora in Nebraska gets up before breakfast. Chadron stretches its waistband with pork, while the village of Wahoo, increasing just 68 souls from 1900 to 1910, showed disregard of President Roosevelt's advice.

Location.	Population.	Appropriation.
Waynesville, N. C.	2,008	\$72,000
Jellico, Tenn.	1,862	80,000
Martin, Tenn.	2,228	55,000
Maryville, Tenn.	2,381	70,000

Tennessee made a big haul for its ruralities. Its advantage is noted, when 6,471 people in three villages get \$205,000 in public buildings. And this gift comes from an administration that in its 1912 Baltimore platform shrieked, "We denounce the profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation," and so forth.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Richfield, Utah.....	2,559	\$60,000
Franklin, Va.....	2,271	50,000
Warrenton, Va.....	1,427	62,000
Waynesboro, Va.....	1,389	57,500

The home State of the Father of his Country was not backward in its demands for "profligate waste wrung from the people (in 1914) by oppressive taxation," as shown by these additional items:

Location.	Popula- tion.	Post-office receipts.
Buena Vista, Va.....	3,245	\$6,358
Cape Charles, Va.....	1,948	7,481
Manassas, Va.....	1,217	7,351
West Point, Va.....	1,397	3,995
Woodstock, Va.....	1,314	6,073

These are Virginia villages that are getting Government monuments through oppressive taxation. More will follow.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Basin, Wyo.....	763	\$56,000
Buffalo, Wyo.....	1,368	69,500
Cody, Wyo.....	1,132	56,000

When the handful of people in the villages of Basin, Buffalo, and Cody, Wyo., learned what the Public Buildings Committee did for those villages, they sang praises for those from whom the money flows. "Government monuments" to prevent the stranger from losing his way are numerous in the wilds of Wyoming.

Again quoting from the 1913 bill, Document 936, page 37:

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Andalusia, Ala.....	2,480	\$50,000
Cordova, Alaska.....	1,152	100,000
Prescott, Ark.....	2,705	50,000
Rogers, Ark.....	2,820	70,000
San Pedro.....		60,000
Willow, Cal.....	1,139	75,000

Willow lost 40 of its souls from 1890 to 1910, but San Pedro did not have enough population in 1890, 1900, or 1910 to get into the Government census. It gets \$60,000, however, from the Federal Treasury. Over \$400,000 given to six villages in "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation during Democratic times of 1914 and over the protest of a Democratic Postmaster General.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Glenwood Springs, Colo.....	2,019	\$100,000
Marianna, Fla.....	1,915	70,000
West Point, Ga.....	1,906	50,000
Aledo, Ill.....	2,144	65,000
North Vernon, Ind.....	2,915	60,000
Girard, Kans.....	2,446	75,000
North Topeka, Kans.....		71,000
Glasgow, Ky.....	2,316	60,000
Marion, Ky.....	1,627	60,000
Fort Fairfield, Me.....	1,621	80,000
Bad Axe, Mich.....	1,559	55,000

What a record for 11 villages, taken in order, that were given approximately three-quarters of a million dollars.

Every appropriation apparently needed a good ax. Remember these are generous public gifts by Uncle Sam, as shown by the 1913 Democratic public-buildings bill. The 1916 bill is of the same general character. Continuing we find—

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Midland, Mich.....	2,527	\$60,000
Fairmont, Minn.....	2,988	65,000

Fairmont shriveled 92 souls from 1900 to 1910, but it crowded into the same 1913 bill.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Butler, Mo.....	2,894	\$60,000
Fayette, Mo.....	2,586	55,000
Harrisonville, Mo.....	1,947	52,500

Good work on the Treasury by Harrisonville, which gained 94 people during the preceding 10 years. Political pull is not lacking for Missouri. The "show me" State lands its share of profligate waste both in rivers and public buildings.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Central City, Nebr.....	2,428	\$55,000
Fallon, Nev.....	741	55,000

That is a good fall out of the Treasury by Fallon. Nevada is one of the newer sister States, but it has learned the ropes without much trouble.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Winnemucca.....	1,786	\$60,000
Fort Plain, N. Y.....	2,762	65,000
Chapel Hill, N. C.....	1,149	60,000

Over \$50 apiece for every mother's son and daughter in the North Carolina crossroads town is a godsend. Certainly such an appropriation for Chapel Hill warrants prayers against "oppressive taxation wrung from the people," according to the Baltimore platform.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Woodward, Okla.....	2,696	\$110,000
Monessen, Pa.....	2,197	90,000

That rescues Monessen when the committee says \$40 per soul expended in the village is a good investment for Uncle Sam. It sounds more like grab and "profligate waste," to use a familiar platform expression.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
State College, Pa.....	851	\$75,000

There is a lesson for Young America in Government economy—on how not to do things. The 1913 Democratic public-buildings bill contained that item of profligacy at \$90 per capita.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Bellefouche, S. Dak.....	1,352	\$75,000
Chamberlain, S. Dak.....	1,275	60,000

These are items in the 1913 keeping-us-in-war-taxes administration. Approximately \$50 for every single soul in these South Dakota crossroads towns is given away by Uncle Sam.

Location.	Popula- tion.	Appropria- tion.
Athens, Tenn.....	2,264	\$50,000
Franklin, Tenn.....	2,924	55,000
Gallatin, Tenn.....	2,399	50,000
Cameron, Tex.....	3,263	55,000
Comanche, Tex.....	2,756	50,000
Commerce, Tex.....	2,818	50,000
Gilmer, Tex.....	1,484	45,000
Honey Grove, Tex.....	2,300	50,000
Mount Pleasant, Tex.....	3,137	55,000
Pittsburg, Tex.....	1,916	55,000
Vernon, Tex.....	3,195	50,000

Above are just a few of the Tennessee and Texas items contained in the 1913 bill. They show the power of pull in creating profligate waste. Yet the Postmaster General from Texas protests against such public waste.

Location.	Population.	Appropriation.
Vernal, Utah.....	836	\$50,000
Farmville, Va.....	2,971	60,000
Front Royal, Va.....	1,133	50,000
Leesburg, Va.....	1,897	55,000
Norton, Va.....	1,866	75,000

This is part of another installment for Virginia contained in the 1913 bill. "Profligate waste," thy name is democracy, and I am not referring to party labels but to a democracy that pays for shocking waste by oppressive taxation.

It should be understood that the bill proper arranges items alphabetically under different subheads. For this reason the disproportion in State allotments and size of villages require tabulating.

One Wisconsin item in the 1913 bill is for a city of less than 5,000 population, but I am offering no defense and only submitting facts which show that notwithstanding the vigorous protest of the minority report over 80 per cent of our public buildings are being erected in towns having less than 5,000 inhabitants and less than \$15,000 annual receipts, and less than \$1,000 annual rental.

Building sites—just building sites alone—carrying several hundred thousands in the aggregate, went to some 60 villages with a population under 3,000. As an illustration, a few building sites for Kentucky are found in the 1913 public-buildings bill, showing the class of villages and crossroads that were generously remembered by the committee, to be hereafter followed up with extravagant appropriations for buildings in these crossroads:

[Document 936, 63d Congress, p. 43.]

Location.	Population.	Annual rent.	Site appropriation.
Barbourville, Ky.....	1,633	\$408	\$5,000
Central City, Ky.....	2,545	250	7,500
Elizabethtown, Ky.....	1,907	400	7,500
Eminence, Ky.....	1,274	193	8,000

Eminence is properly named for nerve temperature when, with 1,274 souls and \$3,825 annual postal receipts, it gets \$8,000 for a building site. That ought to buy 100 acres of good farm land right in the center of the village, and should furnish the chairman of the Democratic national convention in 1912 and 1916 with a gold-headed cane sent by admiring constituents. Think of an \$8,000 building site in a town with \$193 annual rental.

Continuing—

Location.	Population.	Annual rent.	Site appropriation.
Falmouth, Ky.....	1,180	\$340	\$5,000
Harrodsburg, Ky.....	3,147	600	10,000

Hats off to Harrodsburg. Doubtlessly that is enough to buy one of the best business blocks in the village. Even Falmouth could afford to contribute a rainbow necktie toward the garb of the distinguished ex-chairman of the ex-convention and a present statesman from Kentucky.

Location.	Population.	Annual rent.	Site appropriation.
Hodgenville, Ky.....	744	\$300	\$5,000
Murray, Ky.....	942	240	5,000
Paintsville, Ky.....	942	132	5,000
Pikeville, Ky.....	1,280	332	7,500
Prestonburg, Ky.....	1,120	174	5,000

There are no pikers in Pikeville when Uncle Sam pays the bills, but in these times of profligate waste and war taxes there is pork in porkville Kentucky, and the fair State has many struggling villages that lay claim to the biggest share.

The situation in Kentucky's assignment for the last public building sites is worth studying. Eleven of these villages, having an aggregate population of 15,594, were given approximately \$70,000 for building sites. The total annual office receipts in these 11 Kentucky villages reached \$57,978, or an average of slightly over \$5,000 for each village, while Prestonburg reports only \$2,633, or about 25 per cent of the minimum rate recom-

mended by Chairman CLARK in his report, and only 17 per cent of the minimum amount urged by Postmaster General Burleson, who, in his report, denounces this bad practice of buying sites in advance.

These 11 sites were expected to marshal a few votes for the last public-building porous plaster and are certainly a tribute to profligate waste. Eleven public monuments to grab were assigned to Kentucky in 1913 in the single item of building sites. We will discover that the present public-buildings bill is a worthy imitator of its immediate predecessor. Oh, for a Proctor Knott to sing the praises of Hodgenville, Paintsville, and Pikeville, and Murray, and Prestonburg. Duluth, with the second largest harbor in the country, has several times the population of the entire 11 Kentucky villages just enumerated, yet Duluth was an inspiration to Kentucky's distinguished statesmen.

DESERTED FEDERAL COURTHOUSES.

In several cases a Government courthouse is combined with the local post office, and to show just what kind of Government investment that makes, it is stated on page 83 that only seven cities in the United States paid rental for Federal courts prior to the erection of Federal buildings.

The following include a few courthouses generally built with some local post office and the total days of court during a year and cost of building to accommodate that litigation:

Location.	Days per year.	Appropriation.
Tuscaloosa, Ala.....	5	\$157,500
Batesville, Ark.....	6	80,000
Fresno, Cal.....	4	150,000
Sacramento, Cal.....	4	430,000
Fernandina, Fla.....	4	430,000
Marianna, Fla.....	3	175,000
Ocala, Fla.....	5	114,000

That is going some in Florida for a total of 12 days of court, but Florida by legislative accident holds the chairmanships of the two great pork-barrel committees. Counting interest and expense, it costs the Government over \$3,000 a day to provide halls of justice for these Florida litigants. Of course, Florida has many other courthouses built at Government expense, as previously stated.

Kentucky gets a good pull for Federal courthouses:

Location.	Days per year.	Appropriation.
Bowling Green, Ky.....	3	\$145,000
Jackson, Ky.....	9	100,000
Owensboro, Ky.....	5	175,000
Paducah, Ky.....	6	220,500
Richmond, Ky.....	11	130,000

Louisiana is also remembered with vacant "Government monuments."

Location.	Days per year.	Appropriation.
Alexandria, La.....	4	\$125,000
Lake Charles, La.....	5	125,000
Monroe, La.....	4	75,000
Opelousas, La.....	2	50,000

Mississippi gets generous aid as usual.

The Flood Control Committee does not control the flood of "profligate waste" that goes to Mississippi, according to the following Federal court buildings:

Location.	Days per year.	Appropriation.
Aberdeen, Miss.....	8	\$79,000
Biloxi, Miss.....	8	125,000
Clarksdale, Miss.....	5	115,750
Meridian, Miss.....	8	130,000

North Carolina, with usual modesty, gets a few dollars for sundry localities when looking for justice.

Location.	Court days.	Appropriation.
Charlotte, N. C.....	6	\$342,000
Elizabeth City, N. C.....	10	140,000
Newbern, N. C.....	9	95,000
Statesville, N. C.....	6	77,500
Washington, N. C.....	3	144,000
Wilkesboro, N. C.....	5	60,000
Wilmington, N. C.....	10	600,000

This reaches an average cost per day to the Government of about \$3,000 for halls of justice in North Carolina. But, then, a Secretary of the Navy, chairmen of Ways and Means and of Judiciary Committees all make up a formidable front when their State is shouting for public-buildings and river and harbor appropriations.

The list could be extended to cover many other States, and, of course, it is to be understood that many other cities in these States have Federal buildings, and, further, that generous giving is not limited North or South. It is all part of the cash distributing system which has been in vogue during recent years, and which has grown more stupendous and extravagant in the last two or three bills, as will appear from the total amounts to which I desire later to refer.

To the student of public-buildings expenditures both Senate Document 321, Sixty-fourth Congress, and Document 244, Sixty-third Congress, are instructive.

From these documents it appears that in all 1,479 "projects" are for public buildings; several hundred are in towns under 5,000 population, and 216 in towns under 3,000 population. Sixty-six communities of 10,000 people or more are yet unprovided, while the number of corner crossroads and jerk-water towns that are now being provided is rapidly increasing in order to get enough votes for the bill.

Is it not time to take an accounting of stock? With that end in view I have submitted these few facts gathered from official reports which are of special interest in days of plum distribution through the imposition of war taxes.

A hasty analysis of the 1913 public-buildings bill has been given, because it is important for us to understand where public moneys have been wasted in the past when we seek to measure the 1916 bill before us.

Waste, extravagance, and political pull have governed public-buildings bills in recent years, according to facts presented by the Public Buildings Commission. In the bill before us the same method of pork-barrel construction has been pursued, and "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation" seems to be a cardinal virtue with those who stand sponsors for the 1916 bill.

Let us first examine into the method of distribution to congressional districts in order to secure votes for the 1916 bill.

Needless to say, the list of districts or Members is not mentioned by way of individual criticism, but to disclose the vice of the system.

MEMBERS MUST INTRODUCE BILLS.

The only present method of securing building appropriations is by this omnibus bill. However important may be a public building from a Government point of view, irrespective of local desires, Members have no other alternative than that of submitting their requests to the Public Buildings Committee. As stated in the discussion of the wasteful river and harbor bills, Representatives in Congress do not require any defenders of their standards of public or private honesty. No one familiar with the facts will question the high character of Members individually and collectively. Neither does any Member profit financially by measures passed by Congress. If this statement is subject to exception, it is so rare as not to affect the general high estimate of those called upon to serve in either branch of Congress.

We are, however, bound to vicious practices, and one of the most pernicious is the omnibus public-buildings bill. Every constituency may desire a "Government monument," as these public buildings have been airily termed by their defenders. Constituencies are frequently urged to press their claims by interested local parties, and sometimes Representatives are persuaded to join in the omnibus bill by the allowance of some local item in order to insure their support. The system is vicious, wasteful, and notorious. It has become a public scandal and finds few apologists. In presenting the facts disclosed by this bill, it is also with the purpose of offering a substitute measure for the present method, not alone because of profligate waste now incurred but because of the legislative travesty and fundamental wrong comprehended in the average omnibus public-buildings bill.

Every Member must determine his own standards, and I do not presume to question individual acts or motives. I shall not do so in the bill under consideration, but in order to insure correct knowledge of the means of public-buildings distribution I herewith submit tables that were presented in the Senate last session which I have not had opportunity to personally verify. If incorrect in any particular, the House Committee on Public Buildings should rectify misstatements made in other parliamentary bodies.

States listed alphabetically, districts, and amounts set apart in the 1916 public-buildings bill are shown by tabulation:

ALABAMA (10 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Amount.
Extensions, remodeling, etc.: Mobile.....	Gray.....	1st district.....	\$100,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Greenville.....	Dent.....	2d district.....	30,000
Union Springs.....	Steagall.....	3d district.....	30,000
Sylacauga.....	Blackmon.....	4th district.....	30,000
Albertville.....	Burnett.....	7th district.....	25,000
Attalla.....	Burnett.....	7th district.....	30,000
New sites and buildings:			
Athens.....	Almon.....	8th district.....	35,000
New sites only:			
Montgomery.....	Dent.....	2d district.....	175,000
Ozark.....	Steagall.....	3d district.....	5,000
Sheffield.....	Almon.....	8th district.....	5,000

In dividing up the proposed 1916 plums it will be found by a coincidence that the second district gets two, the third district two, the seventh district two, the eighth district two, and the first and fourth one each. An analysis of the population and other items of interest will be found elsewhere in my remarks.

ALASKA.

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost: Juneau.....	Wickersham.....	Delegate.....	\$300,000
Special legislation: Sitka (grant lands owned by Government to Territory as home for aged).			

ARIZONA.

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost: Globe.....	Hayden.....	At large.....	\$25,000
New sites only:			
Bisbee.....	do.....	do.....	25,000
Flagstaff.....	do.....	do.....	7,000
Yuma.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
Special legislation: Nogales.....	do.....	do.....	120,000

Arizona scores five times in the 1916 bill and is well remembered.

The last census gives Flagstaff, Nogales, and Yuma about 2,000 population each, yet these villages are cared for in addition to other cities named. In the average district are many cities that could qualify with larger population than in Flagstaff, Nogales, and Yuma, while in the average State scores of cities of larger relative population would be pleased to receive similar evidence of their Uncle Sam's favor. It is submitted that in view of present costs of maintenance these Arizona items come under the Democratic platform's denunciation of "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation."

ARKANSAS (7 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Forest City.....	Caraway.....	1st district.....	\$25,000
Brinkley.....	Oldfield.....	2d district.....	25,000
Conway.....	Jacoway.....	5th district.....	40,000
Stuttgart.....	Taylor.....	6th district.....	30,000
Eldorado.....	Goodwin.....	7th district.....	25,000
New sites only:			
Blytheville.....	Caraway.....	1st district.....	9,000
Van Buren.....	Wingo.....	4th district.....	6,000
Little Rock.....	Jacoway.....	5th district.....	175,000

It must be conceded that the distribution is fairly generous to Arkansas. The first district, with Forest City of 2,494 inhabitants and Blytheville with 3,849 souls, is taken in blythe and gay. The second district only gets one chance at the grab bag, but Brinkley's 1,740 people are happy in having landed a \$25,000 plum in addition to a \$5,000 building site. In 1890 Brinkley had 1,510 people, and in 1910, after a period of 20 prosperous years, Brinkley registered 1,740, or an annual in-

crease of 11 souls per year. Brinkley's gross receipts reached \$6,752 in 1910, or less than one-half the amount recommended by Mr. Burleson's report. The fourth district has Van Buren, 3,878 souls; the fifth gets two whacks at the Treasury, one for Little Rock and the other for Conway, 2,794 souls. The sixth district gets Stuttgart, with 2,740 watchful waiters, and the seventh is given \$25,000 for Eldorado, with 4,202 souls. Incidentally, seven-eighths of the Arkansas haul is barred by Mr. Burleson's report, but as Arkansas received about \$1,000,000 in the 1916 river and harbor bill for an insignificant commerce, it may be following the precedent there set, in demanding its share of this omnibus bill.

CALIFORNIA (11 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extensions, remodeling, etc.: Sacramento.....	Curry.....	3d district.....	\$50,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
San Francisco.....	Kahn.....	4th district.....	600,000
Oakland.....	Elston.....	6th district.....	650,000
Modesto.....	Church.....	7th district.....	65,000
Long Beach.....	Randall.....	9th district.....	200,000
San Bernardino.....	Kittner.....	11th district.....	70,000
New sites and buildings:			
Petaluma.....	Kent.....	1st district.....	60,000
New sites only:			
Placerville.....	Raker.....	2d district.....	10,000
Susanville.....	do.....	do.....	10,000
San Jose.....	Hayes.....	8th district.....	15,000
San Mateo.....	do.....	do.....	15,000
Santa Monica.....	Stephens.....	10th district.....	15,000
Venice.....	do.....	do.....	1000 0
Redlands.....	Kittner.....	11th district.....	30,000

California's items are mathematically well distributed. Ten of its eleven districts are represented in the bill, and thus, according to all rules of the game, 10 votes are secured for the 8 Arkansas items and the 10 Alabama items. Placerville, with its 1,914 souls, and Susanville, with its 688 watchful waiting villagers, according to the 1910 census, will be able to purchase suitable sites in these enterprising second district villages with their \$10,000 allotments. In fact, these towns are among the prize movievilles of the great Pacific Coast State. In proportion to their size they move the largest haul contained in the bill for two building sites, and for the longest distance, to wit, across the continent. In justice to California it may be said that nearly all of its items are for cities of over 4,000 inhabitants, but Burleson's report protested against appropriations for such cities, and vigorously opposed paying for any sites before an appropriation was made for buildings.

COLORADO (4 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Sterling.....	Timberlake.....	2d district.....	\$55,000
Canon City.....	Keating.....	3d district.....	55,000
Montrose.....	Taylor.....	4th district.....	150,000

Colorado is modest, but then Colorado never had much practice in the public purse; its distinguished delegation has not yet learned the ropes. Next year it may seek a few thousands for Bush Creek or Pawnee Creek in order to float battleships up to Denver. When its delegation once gets started the appetite will grow, for in the money-grab game there is no limit excepting the bottom of the Federal Treasury and the blue sky above.

CONNECTICUT (5 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Manchester.....	Oakey.....	1st district.....	\$40,000
New sites and buildings:			
Norwalk.....	Hill.....	4th district.....	140,000
Winsted.....	Glynn.....	5th district.....	60,000
New sites only:			
Essex.....	Freeman.....	2d district.....	6,000

Connecticut paid \$1,283,695 into the individual income-tax fund in 1915. Florida paid \$229,509 for the same fiscal year, and Georgia paid \$440,600. In the river and harbor roll of grab Florida and Georgia secured many hauls for every single one

given to Connecticut. Florida and Georgia follow on the heels of Connecticut with public buildings, and although their combined individual income-tax contribution does not reach half that paid by Connecticut the State of wooden nutmegs has been badly distanced in the legislative race both in river and harbor allotments and public buildings for jerk-water stations.

DELAWARE (1 DISTRICT).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New building on site acquired or authorized: Newark.....	Miller.....	At large.....	\$30,000

Delaware only has one Representative, and it must be admitted Delaware can not cut as much public-buildings hay as Arizona; but as the Arizona Member spells his politics differently this may account for Flagstaff, Nogales, and Yuma. Newark, Del., with its 1,913 souls, has not quite reached the size of the three Arizona villages, according to the 1910 census, but how many cities of 4,000 inhabitants in the country are unprovided when Burleson's report in 1913 showed 284 cities of 5,000 people or over where no post-office building had been built or authorized? Probably a couple of thousand cities of 4,000 inhabitants have been unprovided, but under the present system of political pull it is not material what size or importance is possessed by any town provided the Representative's vote is secured for the bill. Burleson protested against cities under 5,000 inhabitants in the bill, but Burleson's report does not affect the construction of the 1916 public-buildings bill. An analysis of this bill by Treasury officials shows that Burleson's limitations are far too liberal, judging by estimates of increased expenses which are in part submitted elsewhere.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New sites and buildings:			
Equipment shop, Post Office Department.	Clark.....	2d district, Florida.	\$200,000
Special legislation:			
Department of Justice.....	do.....	do.....	3,000,000
Armory, National Guard.....	Dyer.....	12th district, Missouri.	800,000

FLORIDA (4 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Lake City.....	Clark.....	2d district.....	\$35,000
Kissimmee.....	Sears.....	4th district.....	35,000
New sites and buildings:			
Clearwater.....	Sparkman.....	1st district.....	40,000
New sites only:			
Arcadia.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Monticello.....	Clark.....	2d district.....	5,000
Perry.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
West Palm Beach.....	Sears.....	4th district.....	10,000

The 1913 public-buildings bill carried 11 items for Florida's four districts.

When the river and harbor bill was before the House, the Oklawaha River in Florida was included for an authorized expenditure of \$733,000. On that occasion a rhymster unburdened himself of the following from Mother Goose down to date:

We have a crooked creek, that has a crooked name,
And grabs a crooked million, while in a crooked game,
To make a crooked water power run up a crooked hill,
It crooks your Uncle Samuel through a crooked river bill.

No pride of authorship went with the stanza, and the same is true of another, discovered in an ancient cryptogram of Bacon on bacon. It would seem that he was no mean prophet when we analyze the 1913 public-buildings bill and the 1916 public-buildings bill before us. His deciphered baconic prophecy reads:

There was a crooked crossroads, and a crooked Jim Crow town.
That swiped two crooked building grabs and crooked the public brown.
Each first tried crooked private bills, but crooked bills slept still,
Till all passed together in a crooked building bill.

Let it be said this was not directed toward appropriations in any particular State so far as appears.

Presumably Bacon did not mean that Representatives receive personal benefit from appropriations. Constituencies demand that Members bring home the bacon, so the Kissimmee River and

Kissimmee village are found in both river and public-buildings bills. All the Representative gets is kicks when he fails to secure the amount locally demanded. Clearwater Crossroads, with only 1,171 souls, gets \$40,000 in the public-buildings grab, and running true to form and name it gets \$38,000 for a shallow water front, with \$52,000 more to follow.

Further comment on Florida items may be improper, because two distinguished statesmen from that State, or one-half of its total, through a peculiar coincidence, are chairmen of the River and Harbor and Public Building Committees.

GEORGIA (12 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Waynesboro.....	Edwards.....	1st district.....	\$25,000
Rossville.....	Lee.....	7th district.....	25,000
Monroe.....	Tribble.....	8th district.....	30,000
Sandersville.....	Vinson.....	10th district.....	30,000
New sites only:			
Blakeley.....	Park.....	2d district.....	6,000
Cairo.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
Felham.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
Ashburn.....	Crisp.....	3d district.....	5,000
Cuthbert.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
Decatur.....	Howard.....	5th district.....	8,000
East Point.....	do.....	do.....	8,000
Jackson.....	Wise.....	6th district.....	5,000
Thomaston.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Covington.....	Tribble.....	8th district.....	5,000
Commerce.....	Bell.....	9th district.....	5,000
Winder.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Boxley.....	Walker.....	11th district.....	5,000
Fort Valley.....	Hughes.....	12th district.....	8,000
Hawkinsville.....	do.....	do.....	8,000

I will not presume to comment further upon the amounts allotted to each State and method of distribution beyond calling attention to the fact that practically every Georgia item goes to some small village against the protest contained in the Burleson report. More significant, the items are distributed among 10 of the 12 districts, and thereby insures generous support for a bill which has never been seriously opposed in past years. Permit me to say at this point that this bill and similar bills will probably be opposed, irrespective of the party standing sponsor for such legislation. This prediction is not made as a warning, but the public has awakened to the fact that such bills are constructed on wrong principles, reek with "profligate waste," and are vicious in character. The end of pork barrels will be in sight when a national budget system is put in force.

IDAHO (2 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Coeur d'Alene.....	McCracken.....	At large.....	\$88,200
New sites and buildings:			
Blackfoot.....	Smith.....	do.....	65,000

ILLINOIS (27 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Chicago, Ill.....	Gallagher.....	8th district.....	\$4,250,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Spring Valley.....	Stone.....	16th district.....	30,000
Carlinville.....	Wheeler.....	21st district.....	30,000
Highland.....	Rodenberg.....	22nd district.....	25,000
New sites and buildings:			
Pittsfield.....	W. E. Williams.....	At large.....	35,000
Harvey.....	Wilson.....	3rd district.....	55,000
Peru.....	Fuller.....	12th district.....	45,000
East Moline.....	Tavener.....	14th district.....	45,000
Galva.....	King.....	15th district.....	45,000
Bloomington.....	Sterling.....	17th district.....	150,000
Erlingham.....	Foster.....	23rd district.....	45,000
Carbondale.....	Denison.....	26th district.....	60,000
Extensions, remodeling, etc:			
Oak Park.....	McAndrews.....	6th district.....	150,000
Decatur.....	McKinley.....	19th district.....	50,000
New sites only:			
Lewistown.....	Chipherfield.....	At large.....	5,000

Unthinking Members point with astonishment to the large appropriation recommended for Chicago of \$4,250,000. The business man quickly discovers that Chicago's receipts last year, 1915, reached \$19,650,961.89, or four and one-half times the total appropriation provided. It is less than \$2 per capita, and if further argument is needed there is no other course to pursue. No buildings can be rented or other provision made to care for a great public necessity. On the other hand, we find, same page:

Location.	Appropriation.	Population.	Rental.	Per Capita.
East Moline.....	\$45,000	2,665	\$576	\$17
Pittsfield.....	35,000	2,095	750	17
Galva.....	45,000	2,498	450	18

Not one of these cities reached the 5,000 limit in population or \$1,000 annual rental urged by Mr. Burleson, and only one reached the annual receipts. Yet as an investment Chicago brings back in one year through receipts four and a half times the total amount appropriated for that city. Speaking generally, it will be discovered that Illinois is one of the smallest offenders among the States, and while it has 4 villages under 3,000 population in the 1916 bill North Carolina has 13 such villages in the same bill.

INDIANA (13 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Mt. Vernon.....	Lieb.....	1st district.....	\$40,000
Linton.....	Cullop.....	2d district.....	35,000
Greensburg.....	Dixon.....	4th district.....	45,000
Decatur.....	Adair.....	8th district.....	43,000
Lebanon.....	Morrison.....	9th district.....	45,000
New sites and buildings:			
Hartford City.....	Rauch.....	11th district.....	50,000
Fort Wayne.....	Cline.....	12th district.....	550,000
New sites only:			
Franklin.....	Dixon.....	4th district.....	10,000
Lawrenceburg.....	do.....	do.....	10,000

No detailed analysis of distribution will be attempted beyond a brief statement of facts in each case.

IOWA (11 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extensions, remodeling, etc.:			
Shenandoah.....	Towner.....	8th district.....	\$14,000
Sioux City.....	Steele.....	11th district.....	335,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Fairfield.....	Kennedy.....	1st district.....	50,000
Marengo.....	Hull.....	2d district.....	30,000
Oswego.....	Haugen.....	4th district.....	40,000
Newton.....	Ramseyer.....	6th district.....	55,000
New sites and buildings:			
Eagle Grove.....	Sweet.....	3d district.....	35,000
Knoxville.....	Dowell.....	7th district.....	40,000
Corning.....	Towner.....	8th district.....	35,000
Harlan.....	Green.....	9th district.....	35,000
Algona.....	Woods.....	10th district.....	45,000
New sites only:			
Mount Pleasant.....	Kennedy.....	1st district.....	7,500
Indianola.....	Dowell.....	7th district.....	5,000

The fifth Iowa district, by a peculiar situation disclosed, was omitted from the bill. A good angel must have ignored the district when allotments were made.

Possibly the builders of the bill sought to have this omission counterbalance an extravagant grab by Marengo, which gets \$30,000, has a population of 1,786, annual rental of \$425, and annual receipts of \$7,502.33. It is also noteworthy that every Member of the Iowa delegation, with one exception, fearlessly opposed the 1916 river and harbor pork barrel, notwithstanding the distribution above noted.

KANSAS (8 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extensions—remodeling, etc.:			
Fort Scott.....	Taggart.....	2d district.....	\$5,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Holton.....	Anthony.....	1st district.....	35,000
New sites and buildings:			
Olathe.....	Taggart.....	2d district.....	55,000
Columbia.....	Campbell.....	3d district.....	50,000
Council Grove.....	Doolittle.....	4th district.....	35,000
Junction City.....	Halvering.....	5th district.....	55,000
Norton.....	Connolly.....	6th district.....	35,000
Dodge City.....	Shouse.....	7th district.....	60,000
Wellington.....	Ayres.....	8th district.....	15,000
New sites only:			
Oswego.....	Campbell.....	3d district.....	5,000
Wichita.....	Ayres.....	8th district.....	75,000

The effort to cover Kansas in order to secure the delegation's vote is apparent at a glance. Comparative need by the Government in States or districts has no necessary part in such distribution.

One two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight,
Potent arguments to swing the State.

KENTUCKY (11 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Shelbyville.....	Helm.....	8th district.....	\$25,000
New buildings on sites acquired:			
Murray.....	Barkley.....	1st district.....	25,000
Madisonville.....	Kincheloe.....	2d district.....	40,000
Central City.....	Thomas.....	3d district.....	30,000
Falmouth.....	Rouse.....	6th district.....	25,000
Eminence.....	Cantrill.....	7th district.....	40,000
Pikerville.....	Langley.....	10th district.....	35,000
Barbourville.....	Powers.....	11th district.....	25,000
New sites only:			
Hickman.....	Barkley.....	1st district.....	5,000
Russellville.....	Thomas.....	3d district.....	10,000
Stanford.....	Helm.....	8th district.....	5,000
Pineville.....	Powers.....	11th district.....	5,000
New sites and buildings:			
Hazard.....	Langley.....	10th district.....	40,000

This analysis indicates a generous method of distribution in order to insure support for the bill. Twelve of the above 13 items in Kentucky are for villages under 4,000 inhabitants, none over 5,000, 10 under 3,000, and 1 reached just 537 souls at the time of the last census. Elsewhere I give a brief analysis of that particular phase of the bill.

LOUISIANA (8 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Alexandria.....	Aswell.....	8th district.....	\$30,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Morgan City.....	Martin.....	3d district.....	40,000
New sites and buildings:			
New Orleans.....	Estopinal.....	1st district.....	500,000
Houma.....	Martin.....	3d district.....	50,000
Mansfield.....	Watkins.....	4th district.....	35,000
Plaquemine.....	Morgan.....	6th district.....	35,000
De Ridder.....	Lazare.....	7th district.....	30,000
New sites only:			
Winnfield.....	Aswell.....	8th district.....	5,000

MAINE (4 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Bath.....	McGillicuddy.....	2d district.....	\$10,000
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Houlton.....	Guernsey.....	4th district.....	50,000
New sites and buildings:			
Sanford.....	Hinds.....	1st district.....	50,000
Farmington.....	McGillicuddy.....	2d district.....	45,000

MARYLAND (6 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New sites and buildings:			
Easton.....	Price.....	1st district.....	\$65,000
Special legislation:			
Baltimore ¹	Linthicum.....	4th district.....	
Hagerstown ²	Lewis.....	6th district.....	70,000

MASSACHUSETTS (16 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Boston.....	Tague.....	10th district.....	\$100,000
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Lowell.....	Rogers.....	5th district.....	250,000
Boston.....	Gallivan.....	12th district.....	250,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Framingham.....	Carter.....	13th district.....	100,000
Provincetown.....	Walsh.....	16th district.....	30,000
New sites and buildings:			
Great Barrington.....	Treadway.....	1st district.....	50,000
Gardner.....	Paige.....	3d district.....	90,000
Salem.....	Gardner.....	6th district.....	130,000
Peabody.....	Phelan.....	7th district.....	100,000
Warefield.....	Dallinger.....	8th district.....	65,000
Everett.....	Roberts.....	9th district.....	115,000
New sites only:			
Westboro.....	Winslow.....	4th district.....	15,000
Whitinsville.....	do.....	do.....	10,000
Boston.....	Gallivan.....	12th district.....	1,500,000
Special legislation:			
Malden ³	Roberts.....	9th district.....	

¹ Make appropriation available for finish and equipment.

² Amend legislation to provide new building on present site.

³ Purchase site and erect building within present building limit.

MICHIGAN (13 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Flint.....	Kelley.....	6th district.....	\$100,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Benton Harbor.....	Hamilton.....	4th district.....	80,000
Bozette City.....	Scott.....	11th district.....	30,000
New sites and buildings:			
Marshall.....	Smith.....	3d district.....	75,000
St. Johns.....	Fordney.....	8th district.....	55,000
Ludington.....	McLaughlin.....	9th district.....	75,000
Clare.....	Loud.....	10th district.....	35,000
New sites only:			
Detroit.....	Doremus.....	1st district.....	1,250,000
Eaton Rapids.....	Smith.....	3d district.....	7,500
Alma.....	Fordney.....	8th district.....	5,000

MINNESOTA (10 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Albert Lea.....	Anderson.....	1st district.....	\$50,000
Minneapolis.....	Smith.....	5th district.....	100,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Duluth.....	Miller.....	8th district.....	300,000
New sites and buildings:			
Northfield.....	Davis.....	3d district.....	51,000
Wadena.....	Lindbergh.....	6th district.....	35,000
Litchfield.....	Volstead.....	7th district.....	35,000
Thief River Falls.....	Steenerson.....	9th district.....	55,000
Special legislation:			
Faribault ¹	Davis.....	3d district.....	

MISSISSIPPI (8 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Jackson.....	Collier.....	8th district.....	\$100,000
New sites only:			
Indianola.....	Humphreys.....	3d district.....	5,000
Lexington.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Okolona.....	Sisson.....	4th district.....	5,000
Winona.....	do.....	do.....	7,500
Columbia.....	Harrison.....	6th district.....	5,000
Pascagoula.....	do.....	do.....	5,000

MISSOURI (16 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extensions, remodeling, etc.:			
Columbia.....	Shackleford.....	8th district.....	\$12,000
Jefferson City.....	do.....	do.....	50,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Unionville.....	Lloyd.....	1st district.....	30,000
Trenton.....	Rucker.....	2d district.....	65,000
West Plains.....	Russell.....	14th district.....	40,000
Aurora.....	Decker.....	15th district.....	65,000
Mountain Grove.....	Rubey.....	16th district.....	40,000
New sites and buildings:			
Richmond.....	Alexander.....	3d district.....	40,000
Sedalia.....	Hamlin.....	7th district.....	210,000
Bowling Green.....	Clark.....	9th district.....	40,000
New sites only:			
Milan.....	Rucker.....	2d district.....	5,000
Paris.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Salisbury.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Cameron.....	Alexander.....	3d district.....	5,000
Kansas City.....	Borland.....	5th district.....	1,000,000
Eldorado Springs.....	Dickinson.....	6th district.....	4,000
Rich Hill.....	do.....	do.....	4,000
Windsor.....	do.....	do.....	4,000
Perryville.....	Hensley.....	13th district.....	5,000
Charleston.....	Russell.....	14th district.....	5,000
Noosha.....	Decker.....	15th district.....	5,000

¹ Sell portion of site to city.

Some comparisons are made elsewhere showing the generous treatment afforded Missouri. Only one brief note is here offered. In addition to caring for nearly every Missouri district, the second district enjoys the proud distinction of corraling four luscious plums, present and prospective, among which are noted:

Location.	Population.	Receipts.	Rental.
Milan.....	2,191	\$6,684	\$500
Paris.....	1,474	7,037	540
Salisbury.....	1,834	7,438	500

Match it if you can in the 1916 bill.

"To keep the outs out, in our State of 'Show me,'
We mustn't count pork as expense," sez he.

The corrupt-practices act seems to be a dead letter when no limit is fixed on Government aid. Why not have the corrupt-practices act properly limit the items to be allowed each Member in public-buildings bills to one single piece of bacon? The President urges that the corrupt-practices act be amended. To

Missouri's second district should go the honor of suggesting this amendment.

MONTANA (2 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Missoula.....	Evans.....	At large.....	\$35,000
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Butte.....	do.....	do.....	150,000
New sites and buildings:			
Lewistown.....	Stout.....	do.....	100,000
Special legislation:			
Bozeman. ¹			

NEBRASKA (6 DISTRICTS).

New sites and buildings:			
Superior.....	Shallenberger.....	5th district.....	\$35,000
New sites only:			
David City.....	Sloan.....	4th district.....	6,000
Seward.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
Broken Bow.....	Kinkaid.....	6th district.....	6,000
O'Neill.....	do.....	do.....	6,000

NEVADA (1 DISTRICT).

New buildings and sites:			
Elko.....	Roberts.....	At large.....	\$59,000
New sites only:			
Ely.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Las Vegas.....	do.....	do.....	5,000

NEW HAMPSHIRE (2 DISTRICTS).

Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Manchester.....	Sulloway.....	1st district.....	\$225,000
New sites and buildings:			
Claremont.....	Wason.....	2d district.....	55,000

NEW JERSEY (12 DISTRICTS).

Increase in limit of cost:			
Millville.....	Bacharach.....	2d district.....	\$25,000
Montclair.....	Lehlbach.....	10th district.....	10,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Passaic.....	Drukker.....	7th district.....	125,000
New sites and buildings:			
Phillipsburg.....	Hart.....	6th district.....	60,000
Weehawken.....	Eagan.....	11th district.....	125,000
Special legislation:			
Atlantic City. ²	Bacharach.....	2d district.....	60,000
Newark. ³	Lehlbach.....	10th district.....	600,000

NEW MEXICO (1 DISTRICT).

New sites and buildings:			
Silver City.....	Hernandez.....	At large.....	\$60,000

NEW YORK (43 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Long Island City.....	Caldwell.....	2d district.....	\$100,000
Yonkers.....	Oglesby.....	24th district.....	51,500
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Albany.....	Postmaster General.....	28th district.....	10,000
Plattsburg.....	Snell.....	31st district.....	50,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Bronx.....	Bruckner.....	22d district.....	\$350,000
Nyack.....	Husted.....	25th district.....	50,000
Oneida.....	Mott.....	32d district.....	55,000
Binghamton.....	Fairchild.....	34th district.....	500,000
Lyons.....	Gould.....	36th district.....	40,000
Bath.....	Pratt.....	37th district.....	50,000
New sites and buildings:			
Newburgh.....	Platt.....	26th district.....	140,000
Literty.....	Ward.....	27th district.....	55,000
Mechanicsville.....	Parker.....	29th district.....	55,000
Canajoharie.....	Charles.....	30th district.....	60,000
Ticonderoga.....	Hugo.....	31st district.....	35,000
Ilion.....	Snyder.....	33d district.....	65,000
Dansville.....	Danforth.....	39th district.....	60,000
New sites only:			
Potsdam.....	Snell.....	31st district.....	9,000
Lowville.....	Mott.....	32d district.....	10,000
Albion.....	Danforth.....	39th district.....	10,000
Wellsville.....	Hamilton.....	43d district.....	12,500
Special legislation:			
Utica, N. Y. ⁴	Snyder.....	33d district.....	

¹ Donation of part of site to city.

² Purchase of certain land and improvements.

³ Post office, courthouse, etc., new site and building or additional land and enlarge present building.

⁴ Revised legislation to tear down building.

NORTH CAROLINA (10 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Wilson.....	Kitchin.....	2d district.....	\$75,000
Wadesboro.....	Page.....	7th district.....	5,000
Rockingham.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Edenton.....	Small.....	1st district.....	25,000
Mount Olive.....	Hood.....	3d district.....	30,000
Mount Airy.....	Stedman.....	5th district.....	55,000
Lumberton.....	Godwin.....	6th district.....	30,000
Lenoir.....	Doughton.....	8th district.....	30,000
New sites and buildings:			
Morganton.....	Webb.....	9th district.....	35,000
New sites only:			
Williamston.....	Small.....	1st district.....	5,000
Clinton.....	Hood.....	3d district.....	5,000
Louisburg.....	Pou.....	4th district.....	6,000
Dunn.....	Godwin.....	6th district.....	7,000
Sanford.....	Page.....	7th district.....	7,000
Albemarle.....	Doughton.....	8th district.....	8,000
Marion.....	Britt.....	10th district.....	6,000

¹ Also increase in limit of cost.

In passing, it may be noted that for mathematical perfection North Carolina always brightly shines, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Read over the list of grabs for small cross-roads towns, and then say which one of the 10 districts in Secretary Daniels's State was overlooked, and also predict how many votes will be given to this bill by North Carolina when the roll is called. It may need another boost of war taxes by the Ways and Means Committee, but why worry when North Carolina holds the key to such legislation. It may also seem politically significant, as shown above, that Wilson is the first to raise the limit. But Wilson is peculiarly the one town with over 5,000 population, while 13 of the 16 North Carolina items are in towns under 3,000 people.

NORTH DAKOTA (3 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Jamestown.....	Young.....	2d district.....	\$35,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Fargo.....	Helgeson.....	1st district.....	250,000

OHIO (22 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Staubenville.....	Hollingsworth.....	18th district.....	\$125,000
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Findlay.....	Key.....	8th district.....	50,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Napoleon.....	Matthews.....	5th district.....	35,000
Urbana.....	Fess.....	7th district.....	50,000
Niles.....	Cooper.....	19th district.....	55,000
New sites and buildings:			
Eaton.....	Gard.....	3d district.....	35,000
Port Clinton.....	Sherwood.....	9th district.....	40,000
Circleville.....	Ricketts.....	11th district.....	65,000
Norwalk.....	Overmeyer.....	13th district.....	65,000
Mount Vernon.....	Ashbrook.....	17th district.....	70,000
Painesville.....	Emerson.....	22d district.....	70,000
New sites only:			
Gallion.....	Key.....	8th district.....	15,000
Columbus.....	Brumbaugh.....	12th district.....	240,000
East Palestine.....	Hollingsworth.....	18th district.....	7,500

OKLAHOMA (8 DISTRICTS).

New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Hobart.....	McClintic.....	7th district.....	\$40,000
Alva.....	Morgan.....	8th district.....	45,000
New sites and buildings:			
Vinita.....	Davenport.....	1st district.....	100,000
Hugo.....	Carter.....	3d district.....	58,000
Sapulpa.....	Murray.....	4th district.....	70,000
New sites only:			
Bartlesville.....	Davenport.....	1st district.....	15,000
Norman.....	Thompson.....	5th district.....	7,000
Stillwater.....	do.....	do.....	7,000
Anadarko.....	Ferris.....	6th district.....	7,000
Duncan.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Waurika.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Ponca City.....	Morgan.....	8th district.....	7,500
Special legislation:			
Okmulgee. ¹	Hastings.....	2d district.....	135,000

¹ Purchase building and remodel same.

Without questioning the reasons for a distribution which generously covers all eight of Oklahoma's districts and thus in-

sures the full delegation's support of the bill, in view of the statement of the Public Buildings Commission's report that 280 cities of 5,000 inhabitants and over are unprovided with public buildings, and no building should be erected where rental is less than \$1,000 annually, what excuse exists for the "profligate waste" demonstrated in these items which are similar to others?

Location.	Popula- tion.	Renta- tion.
Anacarko.....	3,439	\$540
Puman.....	2,477	480
Waurika.....	2,328	400
Ponca City.....	2,521	840

Why provide sites in advance by separate appropriations?

OREGON (3 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
St. Johns.....	McArthur.....	3d district.....	\$25,000
New sites and buildings:			
Hood River.....	Sinnot.....	2d district.....	60,000
Oregon City.....	Hawley.....	1st district.....	70,000
New sites only:			
Corvallis.....	do.....	do.....	10,000

PENNSYLVANIA (36 DISTRICTS).

Increase in limit of cost:			
York.....	Lafean.....	At large.....	\$25,000
Sunbury.....	Leshner.....	16th district.....	40,000
Lewistown.....	Focht.....	17th district.....	20,000
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Norristown.....	Watson.....	8th district.....	55,000
Scranton.....	Farr.....	10th district.....	100,000
Pottsville.....	Heaton.....	12th district.....	50,000
Williamsport.....	Kiess.....	15th district.....	80,000
Beaver Falls.....	Temple.....	24th district.....	58,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Lancaster.....	Griest.....	9th district.....	250,000
Tyrone.....	Bailey.....	19th district.....	80,000
Kittanning.....	North.....	27th district.....	50,000
New sites and buildings:			
Lansdowne.....	Butler.....	7th district.....	65,000
Nanticoke.....	Casey.....	11th district.....	60,000
Middletown.....	Kreider.....	18th district.....	65,000
Phillipsburg.....	Rowland.....	21st district.....	60,000
Somerset.....	Hopwood.....	23d district.....	58,000
Greenville.....	Miller.....	28th district.....	75,000
Duquesne.....	Barchfield.....	32d district.....	75,000
New sites only:			
Philadelphia.....	Moore.....	3d district.....	750,000
Doylestown.....	Watson.....	8th district.....	5,000
Plymouth.....	Casey.....	11th district.....	15,000
Lewistown.....	Focht.....	17th district.....	10,000
Brookville.....	North.....	21st district.....	10,000
Midland.....	Temple.....	24th district.....	5,000
Special legislation:			
Pittsburgh ¹	Garland.....	At large.....	50,000
Do. ²	do.....	do.....	50,000

PORTO RICO.

Special legislation: San Juan ³	Clark.....	2d district, Florida.....	
--	------------	---------------------------	--

RHODE ISLAND (3 DISTRICTS).

Increase in limit of cost:			
Narragansett Pier.....	Stiness.....	2d district.....	\$10,000
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Providence.....	O'Shaunessy.....	1st district.....	75,000

SOUTH CAROLINA (7 DISTRICTS).

Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Aiken.....	Byrnes.....	2d district.....	\$75,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Dillon.....	Ragsdale.....	6th district.....	25,000
New sites and buildings:			
Greenwood 4.....	Aiken.....	3d district.....	125,000
New sites only:			
Manning.....	Whaley.....	1st district.....	5,000
Summerville.....	do.....	do.....	5,000
Bamberg.....	Byrnes.....	2d district.....	5,000
Easley.....	Aiken.....	3d district.....	5,000
Greer.....	Nicholls.....	4th district.....	5,000
York.....	Finley.....	5th district.....	9,000
Conway.....	Ragsdale.....	6th district.....	3,000
Hartsville.....	do.....	do.....	3,000
Special legislation:			
Rock Hill ⁵	Finley.....	5th district.....	125,000

¹ Sell lot owned by Government.

² Federal building, extension and remodeling.

³ Sell warehouse site.

⁴ Also sale of present site and building.

⁵ Post office, courthouse, etc., new site and building and sell present one, or to erect new courthouse on additional land for \$100,000.

Six of the seven South Carolina districts are cared for in the 12 items above named, and these items are fairly evenly divided among the different districts.

The following villages get new sites:

	Popula- tion.	Rent.
Manning.....	1,854	\$350
Summerville.....	2,355	440
Bamberg.....	1,937	220
Easley.....	2,983	300
Greer.....	1,673	360
York.....	2,325	600
Conway.....	1,228	490
Hartsville.....	2,365	480

The statement of facts is offered without comment.

SOUTH DAKOTA (3 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Extension, remodeling, etc.:			
Aberdeen.....	Johnson.....	2d district.....	\$60,000
New building on sites acquired or authorized:			
Vermilion.....	Dillon.....	1st district.....	35,000
New sites only:			
Canton.....	do.....	do.....	6,000

TENNESSEE (10 DISTRICTS).

New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Rogersville.....	Sells.....	1st district.....	\$25,000
Huntingdon.....	Sims.....	8th district.....	25,000
New sites only:			
Lafollette.....	Austin.....	2d district.....	6,000
Lenoir City.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
Rockwood.....	do.....	do.....	6,000
McMinnville.....	Moon.....	3d district.....	5,000
Lewisburg.....	Houston.....	5th district.....	5,000
Dickson.....	Padgett.....	7th district.....	5,000
Brownsville.....	Garrett.....	9th district.....	5,000

A brief comment in passing is again offered. In 13 Southern States an incomplete statement of income tax for fiscal year to June 30, 1915, is reported at \$4,855,902. In 13 Northern States \$65,308,684, or for every dollar paid by the 13 Southern States \$13 was paid by 13 Northern States. Sectionalism is not absent in the 1916 bill, as evidenced by every page of the bill. Take the above items for illustration. Not one complies with Burleson's report or even Chairman CLARK's report:

Location.	Popula- tion.	Rental.	Receipts.
Rogersville.....	1,242	\$190	\$5,466
Huntingdon.....	1,112	360	4,156
Lafollette.....	2,816	425	5,426
Lenoir.....	3,392	500	5,985
Rockwood.....	3,690	360	5,888
McMinnville.....	2,299	540	8,724
Lewisburg.....	1,830	360	9,431
Dickson.....	1,850	425	7,451
Brownsville.....	2,882	660	8,111

In the Public Buildings Commission's report, signed by Chairman CLARK, occurs the recommendation that no public building be authorized where annual receipts are less than \$10,000 per year, and in the consideration of each project "a comparison of rental values for suitable quarters, together with cost of maintenance and operation, including interest at 3 per cent * * * shall be made in order that it may be determined whether its erection would be a desirable investment or not." Not one item meets that condition. All are "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation."

Who pays these extravagant bills? I have given facts to show how bad this bill is. How can we support it?

TEXAS (18 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Paris.....	Black.....	1st district.....	\$170,000
Crockett.....	Gregg.....	7th district.....	25,000
Huntsville.....	Eagle.....	8th district.....	30,000
Georgetown.....	Buchanan.....	10th district.....	30,000
Coleman.....	Slayden.....	14th district.....	30,000
Seguin.....	Garner.....	15th district.....	30,000
Sweetwater.....	Smith.....	16th district.....	35,000

TEXAS (18 DISTRICTS)—continued.

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New sites and buildings:			
Kingsville.....	McLemore.....	At Large.....	\$40,000
Lufkin.....	Dies.....	2d district.....	35,000
Mexia.....	Hardy.....	6th district.....	35,000
Fort Worth.....	Callaway.....	12th district.....	700,000
Plainview.....	Stephens.....	13th district.....	45,000
New sites only:			
San Benito.....	Davis.....	At large.....	6,000
Henderson.....	Young.....	3d district.....	5,000
Alvin.....	Burgess.....	9th district.....	6,000
Lockhart.....	Buchanan.....	10th district.....	6,000
Special legislation:			
Dallas ¹	Summers.....	5th district.....	550,000
Dallas ²	do.....	do.....	1,250,000

¹ Subpost office and site.² Courthouse and other branches.

Elsewhere will be shown a brief analysis of the Texas items, but here it is sufficient to say that three-fourths of the above 16 items are located in villages under 4,000 people, one-half in villages under 3,000 people, and one-quarter in crossroads under 2,000 people. In the 1913 bill the 18 Texas districts gobbled up 28 projects. In this symmetrically built pork barrel every district has been cared for, with several notable exceptions.

Dallas, of Trinity River fame, gets a modest \$1,800,000, but the same criticism which covers nearly every State's allotment is, first, that the items are allotted, and, second, that they are distributed without reference to Government interests or needs. Texas items are no exception to the rule.

What can be said to justify buildings in many of the above, including San Benito, with no population given in 1910, and rent of \$15 per month; or Henderson, with no population given in 1910, and rent of \$25 per month; or Alvin, with 1,453 population in 1910, and rent of \$100 per year; or Lockhart, with 2,945 population in 1910, and rent of \$660 per year?

What a commentary on "profligate waste" is offered by Texas and by practically every other State.

UTAH (2 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Park City.....	Howell.....	1st district.....	\$10,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Nephi.....	do.....	do.....	*25,000

VIRGINIA (10 DISTRICTS).

Extensions, remodeling, etc.:			
Norfolk.....	Holland.....	2d district.....	\$650,000
Roanoke.....	Glass.....	6th district.....	75,000
Harrisonburg.....	Hay.....	7th district.....	60,000
Alexandria.....	Carlin.....	8th district.....	75,000
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
West Point.....	Montague.....	3d district.....	25,000
New sites and buildings:			
Bristol.....	Slemp.....	9th district.....	80,000
Staunton.....	Flood.....	10th district.....	85,000

The 1913 bill was exceptionally generous to Virginia, as I have heretofore shown.

WASHINGTON (5 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New sites and buildings:			
Hoquiam.....	Johnson.....	3d district.....	\$75,000
Seattle.....	Humphrey.....	1st district.....	275,000
Special legislation:			
McNeil Island ¹	Johnson.....	3d district.....	10,000

WEST VIRGINIA (5 DISTRICTS).

New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
New Martinsville.....	Neeley.....	1st district.....	\$40,000
New sites and buildings:			
Keyser.....	Bowers.....	2d district.....	55,000
Lewisburg.....	Littlepage.....	3d district.....	82,000
Princeton.....	Cooper.....	5th district.....	45,000
New sites only:			
Beckley.....	Sutherland.....	At Large.....	10,000
Mannington.....	Neeley.....	1st district.....	10,000
Berkeley Spring.....	Bowers.....	2d district.....	10,000

¹ Penitentiary, additional land.

WISCONSIN (11 DISTRICTS).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
Increase in limit of cost:			
Milwaukee.....	Cary.....	4th district.....	\$100,000
Extensions, remodeling, etc.:			
Kenosha.....	Cooper.....	1st district.....	75,000
Appleton.....	Konop.....	9th district.....	50,000
New sites and buildings:			
Portage.....	Burke.....	2d district.....	57,000
Reedsburg.....	Esch.....	7th district.....	40,000
Grand Rapids.....	Browne.....	8th district.....	70,000
Sturgeon Bay.....	Konop.....	9th district.....	40,000
Ladysmith.....	Lenroot.....	11th district.....	35,000
New sites only:			
Menasha.....	Reilly.....	6th district.....	10,000
Two Rivers.....	do.....	do.....	10,000

WYOMING (1 DISTRICT).

Location.	Representative.	District.	Appropriation.
New buildings on sites acquired or authorized:			
Green River.....	Mondell.....	At Large.....	\$25,000
Newcastle.....	do.....	do.....	25,000

The first analysis of the 1916 bill just offered is to show its method of preparation, the skill in distribution of items, and the generally objectionable character of the 1916 omnibus public-buildings bill.

An important finding of the Public Buildings Commission in this connection occurs when, on page 82, the statement is made that in 284 cities in 1910, each having a population of 5,000 or over, no post-office building had been built or authorized; and this is coupled with the statement that in 508 cities of the United States postal receipts reached over \$10,000 at offices in private quarters, but at the time of that report, April 30, 1914, and consequently up to the present time none of these cities have been provided for in the six omnibus bills the first of which was passed in 1902 and which in the aggregate have authorized over \$150,000,000 for public buildings.

Leaving out of consideration the insistence by General Burleson that minimum receipts should not be less than \$15,000 per annum, and the further demonstrable fact by the Treasury Department that even this figure is far too low if Government business interests are to be considered, we may well ask what has been the method of preparing omnibus bills in the past?

Why have these 508 cities and the 284 cities been ignored in past bills, and why have hundreds of country crossroads elbowed the larger towns out of the way? On this subject the commission provides some interesting statistics as follows:

SECTIONAL DISCRIMINATION.

The favored States that had provided buildings with Federal money in all of the cities of 5,000 inhabitants or over, according to the report, are as follows:

Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and West Virginia.

Among States having only one city of 5,000 people waiting for one of Uncle Sam's monuments, are the following:

Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, Oregon, Virginia, and Wyoming.

States having only two cities unprovided are Kentucky, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington.

In other words, the 30 States named were so well taken care of by the Public Buildings Committee that only 17 cities existed in the entire list with a population of 5,000 or more which were unprovided with Government buildings, whereas the remaining 18 States have 267 cities of 5,000 population or over without Government monuments.

It is interesting to note the sectional distribution of these plums. All towns of 5,000 population have been provided by law in the States of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

States having only one shorn lamb left out in the cold include Alabama, Louisiana, and Virginia.

States possessing two deserted lamblets in 1913 include Kentucky, Texas, and Oklahoma.

I do not overlook the fact that several Northern States with aggressive Members have cleaned up waste places in their States in past years, and, it is immaterial where located, the method of congressional distribution speaks for itself.

Another interesting statement appears on page 77 of the report put forth by the Public Buildings Commission last session, and I invite attention to the preceding list when comparisons are made.

There are 508 cities in the United States where local post-office receipts reach \$10,000 or more annually which are not provided with public buildings.

States which have no such city unprovided include Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

States with one shorn lamb, Alabama.

States with two shorn lambs, Florida and Louisiana.

In the foregoing 11 States just 5 cities with receipts of \$10,000 or over are unprovided out of 508 cities throughout the country. States that have a generous grist of such cities left out in the cold by the Public Buildings Committee are:

Cities with \$10,000 receipts.

Pennsylvania.....	77
New York.....	56
Massachusetts.....	40
Michigan.....	21
Indiana.....	17
Iowa.....	17
New Jersey.....	25
Wisconsin.....	22
Ohio.....	39
California.....	33
Illinois.....	30

Eleven Northern States have unprovided 377 cities of that class.

Eleven Southern States have unprovided 5 cities of that class.

The rule may not be enforced on sectional lines, but at the risk of being criticized for sectionalism, as in the case of the river and harbor bill, I set forth official statistics, leaving to the individual Member such deduction as he cares to make.

In the case of river and harbor bills I showed that approximately one-half of the appropriations, which now average annually over \$40,000,000 for all our waterways, goes to Southern States, although less than 2 per cent of our actual waterway commerce is handled by those States and less than 7 per cent of the total contributions to the Federal Treasury come from those 13 States.

The showing with the \$50,000,000 so-called flood-control bill for the reclamation of 16,000,000 acres of land along the Mississippi River is of the same general character. Possibly the fact that 31 chairmen of important House committees out of 32 come from the 13 States of the solid South creates a suspicion that sectionalism is not absent in appropriation bills.

As previously stated, 13 Southern States contributed income taxes to the Federal Treasury in 1915 reaching \$4,855,902, whereas 13 Northern States contributed \$65,308,684, or 13 to 1.

In the distribution of building items in the allotment to States, or in the omnibus 1916 public-building bill, the splendid political symmetry of the barrel is not affected by the needs of Government or by the comparative size of States or taxes contributed. For this reason New York and Missouri are a stand-off, although New York is nearly three times as large politically and eighteen times as large in tax contributions. Alabama and Michigan furnish food for thought, while Massachusetts and Kentucky pair off in items. Other States are briefly compared to show how the builders labored to give every favored State an equal allotment on the vote basis.

In order to cover some districts it was found necessary to build Government monuments in unknown villages, crossroads, and jerk-water junctions, but nothing has stumped the committee. These comparisons are offered in order to demonstrate the injustice to the Government and States brought about by an omnibus bill that presumably has never been excelled in its tribute to profligate waste.

Alabama and Michigan, 10 items each (1916 bill).

ALABAMA.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Mobile.....	\$100,000		7
Albertville.....	25,000	1,544	9
Attalla.....	30,000	2,513	9
Greenville.....	30,000	3,377	11
Elyacauga.....	30,000	1,450	15
Union Springs.....	25,000	4,065	15
Athens.....	35,000	1,715	16
Montgomery.....	175,000	38,136	30
Ozark.....	5,000	2,229	30
Sheffield.....	5,000	4,865	32

MICHIGAN.

Flint.....	\$100,000	38,350	5
Benton Harbor.....	80,000	9,185	9
Boyer City.....	30,000	5,218	9
Claire.....	35,000	1,350	16
Ludington.....	75,000	9,132	20
Marshall.....	75,000	4,236	20
St. Johns.....	55,000	3,154	23
Alma.....	5,000	2,757	25
Detroit.....	1,250,000		27
Eaton Rapids.....	7,500	2,197	27

Alabama.

Number of items 1916.....	10
Number of items 1913.....	11
Number of districts.....	10
Income tax paid 1915.....	\$261,763

Michigan.

Number of items 1916.....	10
Number of items 1913.....	11
Number of districts.....	13
Income tax paid 1915.....	\$2,913,307

	Alabama.	Michigan.
Villages under 2,000.....	3	1
Villages under 3,000.....	5	3
Villages under 4,000.....	6	4
Cities over 5,000.....	2	5

The disproportion in size of towns in the foregoing comparison is not so striking as will appear in other cases, but it is significant, and the fact is also worth considering that every Alabama district is cared for on the average, although its contribution to the Federal Treasury does not reach 10 per cent of the amount paid in by Michigan. In other words, it depends upon a symmetrical shaping of the buildings bill to secure votes from practically every district, both North and South.

Kentucky and Massachusetts, 13 items each (1916 bill).

KENTUCKY.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Shelbyville.....	\$25,000	3,412	3
Barbourville.....	25,000	1,633	9
Central City.....	30,000	2,545	10
Eminence.....	40,000	1,274	10
Falmouth.....	25,000	1,180	10
Madisonville.....	40,000	4,966	12
Murray.....	25,000	2,089	13
Pikeville.....	35,000	1,280	14
Hazard.....	40,000	537	19
Hickman.....	5,000	2,739	28
Pineville.....	5,000	2,161	30
Russellville.....	10,000	3,111	31
Stanford.....	5,000	1,532	32

MASSACHUSETTS.

Boston.....	\$100,000	670,000	2
Do.....	250,000	670,000	5
Do.....	1,500,000	670,000	25
Lowell.....	250,000	106,294	6
Provincetown.....	30,000	4,369	14
Everett.....	115,000	33,484	18
Farmington.....	100,000	12,948	18
Gardner.....	90,000	14,699	18
Great Barrington.....	50,000	5,926	18
Peabody.....	100,000	15,721	22
Salem.....	130,000	43,697	23
Wakefield.....	65,000	11,404	24
Westboro.....	15,000	5,446	32
Whitinsville.....	10,000	4,000	32

Kentucky.

Number of items, 1916.....	13
Number of items, 1913.....	17
Number of districts.....	11
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$576,957

Massachusetts.

Number of items, 1916.....	14
Number of items, 1913.....	10
Number of districts.....	16
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$4,536,141

	Kentucky.	Massachusetts.
Villages under 2,000 (1916).....	6	
Villages under 3,000.....	10	
Villages under 4,000.....	12	
Cities over 5,000.....		12

The above comparison carries its own argument. What more need be said to show the character of the 1916 bill? Kentucky villages, all of them, are provided.

Illinois and North Carolina (1916 bill).

ILLINOIS—13 ITEMS IN BILL.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Chicago.....	\$4,250,000	2,447,043	2
Decatur.....	50,000	31,140	5
Carlinville.....	30,000	3,616	7
Highland.....	25,000	2,675	11

Illinois and North Carolina (1916 bill)—Continued.
ILLINOIS—13 ITEMS IN BILL—continued.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Spring Valley.....	\$30,000	7,035	14
Bloomington.....	150,000	25,768	15
Carbondale.....	60,000	5,411	16
East Moline.....	45,000	2,665	17
Efingham.....	45,000	3,898	18
Galva.....	45,000	2,498	19
Harvey.....	55,000	7,227	20
Peru.....	45,000	7,884	22
Pittsfield.....	35,000	2,095	22

NORTH CAROLINA—16 ITEMS IN BILL.

Rockingham.....	\$5,000	2,155	3
Wadesboro.....	5,000	2,376	3
Wilson.....	75,000	6,717	3
Lenoir.....	30,000	2,480	12
Edenton.....	25,000	3,046	10
Lumberton.....	30,000	2,330	12
Mount Airy.....	55,000	3,844	12
Mount Olive.....	30,000	1,071	13
Morgantown.....	35,000	2,712	21
Albemarle.....	8,000	2,500	24
Clinton.....	5,000	1,101	26
Dunn.....	7,000	1,823	27
Louisberg.....	6,000	1,775	29
Marion.....	6,000	1,519	29
Sanford.....	7,000	2,282	31
Williamston.....	5,000	1,574	33

Illinois.			
Number of items, 1916.....			13
Number of items, 1913.....			21
Number of districts.....			27
Income tax paid, 1915.....		\$5,654,151	

North Carolina.			
Number of items, 1916.....			16
Number of items, 1913.....			10
Number of districts.....			10
Income tax paid, 1915.....		\$381,078	

	Illinois.	North Carolina.
Villages under 2,000.....		6
Villages under 3,000.....	4	13
Villages under 4,000.....	6	15
Cities over 5,000.....	7	1

The foregoing comparison shows where and how the money goes. North Carolina, with slightly more than one-third of the districts contained in Illinois and with about 7 per cent proportionate contribution to the Federal Treasury, gets 16 public buildings for its 10 districts, compared with 13 for Illinois' 27 districts, and of those in North Carolina 15 are under 4,000 population and 6 under 2,000. North Carolina provides the "ways" for profligate waste and Illinois the "means," while North Carolina controls both.

From the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, a New York paper, I find a list of several Florida public-buildings bills which are reported to have been introduced during the present session:

Villages.	Population.	Appropriation.
Tarpon Springs, Fla.....	2,212	\$75,000
Plant City, Fla.....	2,481	100,000
Fort Meyers, Fla.....	2,463	100,000
Fort Meade, Fla.....	1,165	100,000
Brooksville, Fla.....	979	100,000
Bradentown, Fla.....	1,886	100,000
Arcadia, Fla.....	1,736	100,000
West Palm Beach, Fla.....	1,743	156,000
Fort Pierce, Fla.....	1,333	156,000
Lake City, Fla.....	5,032	260,000
Perry, Fla.....	21,012	25,000
Monticello, Fla.....	1,829	25,000

¹ Representative SPARKMAN.

² Representative CLARK.

³ Site.

Florida's demands upon her Representatives, according to the Public Buildings Commission's report, had all been exhausted down to crossroads and villages, so that the foregoing is explained on the general supposition that these villages are next in order. We will have a continuing lower average population in this process of caring for Florida first, second, and last.

Possibly some excuse could be offered for the indiscretion of a new Member who several years ago introduced two bills for cities larger than 11 of the foregoing 12 projects, but what shall be said of two distinguished Members, with a total of over 30

years' service to their credit, who in the face of the Public Buildings Commission's report introduce 11 such bills?

Eight hundred thousand dollars for an even dozen Florida crossroad villages, with a total 1910 population of 23,871, is their contribution to public-buildings legislation offered this session by the two distinguished Florida chairmen of the River and Harbor and Public Buildings Committees. This statement is not offered by way of individual criticism, but rather because of the fact that to such distinguished gentlemen are assigned the construction of two omnibus bills which enjoy the titles of "pork barrels."

It is only fair to the committee to say that this Florida list was cut down in the 1916 bill, although the four districts are handsomely cared for compared with the allotments made to other States. Possibly this curtailment is due to the fact that in the last public-buildings bill Florida secured 11 items, as has been hereinbefore set forth, or an average of over four items in the last two bills for every one of the four Florida districts. A comparison between Florida and Minnesota is of interest, particularly in view of the comparative contributions to the Federal Treasury made by each State.

Florida and Minnesota, 7 items each (1916 bill).

FLORIDA.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Kissimmee.....	\$35,000	2,157	11
Lake City.....	35,000	5,032	11
Clear Water.....	40,000	1,171	17
Arcadia.....	5,000	1,736	25
Monticello.....	5,000	1,829	30
Perry.....	5,000	1,012	30
West Palm Beach.....	10,000	1,743	32

Number of items, 1916.....	7
Number of items, 1913.....	11
Number of districts.....	4
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$229,509

MINNESOTA.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Albert Lea.....	\$50,000	6,192	4
Minneapolis.....	100,000	301,408	7
Duluth.....	300,000	78,466	10
Litchfield.....	35,000	2,333	20
Northfield.....	51,000	3,265	21
Thief River Falls.....	55,000	3,714	24
Wadena.....	35,000	1,820	24

Number of items, 1916.....	7
Number of items, 1913.....	6
Number of districts.....	10
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$2,033,528

	Florida.	Minnesota.
Villages under 2,000.....	5	1
Villages under 3,000.....	6	2
Villages under 4,000.....	6	4
Cities over 5,000.....	1	3

Again the comparison is startling between States apportioned the same number of building items. It takes 18 items in the last two bills to appease Florida's 4 districts, whereas 13 items are apportioned to the 10 Minnesota districts. Minnesota furnishes over \$8 for every \$1 contributed by Florida, and 5 of the Florida items are in villages of less than 2,000 inhabitants. Recent history does not record any protest from Florida against the public buildings or river and harbor bills. The reason is not hard to find.

Ohio and Texas (1916 bill).

OHIO—14 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Steuersville.....	\$125,000	22,391	3
Findlay.....	50,000	14,858	5
Napoleon.....	35,000	4,007	13
Niles.....	55,000	8,361	13
Urbana.....	50,000	7,739	15
Circleville.....	65,000	6,744	15
Eaton.....	35,000	3,187	18
Mount Vernon.....	70,000	9,087	21
Norwalk.....	65,000	7,858	22
Painesville.....	70,000	5,591	22
Port Clinton.....	40,000	3,097	22
Columbus.....	240,000	181,521	26
East Palestine.....	7,500	3,537	27
Gallion.....	15,000	7,214	27

Ohio and Texas (1916 bill)—Continued.

TEXAS—16 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Coleman.....	\$30,000	3,046	10
Crockett.....	25,000	3,947	10
Georgetown.....	30,000	3,096	11
Paris.....	170,000	11,269	14
Seguin.....	30,000	3,116	14
Sweetwater.....	35,000	4,176	15
Fort Worth.....	500,000	73,312	18
Kingsville.....	40,000	(1)	20
Lufkin.....	35,000	2,749	20
Mexia.....	35,000	2,694	20
Plainview.....	45,000	2,829	22
Alvin.....	6,000	1,452	25
Henderson.....	5,000	(1)	28
Lockhart.....	6,000	2,945	29
San Benito.....	6,000	(1)	31
Dallas.....	500,000	92,104	43
Do.....	1,250,000		43

¹ Not in census.

Ohio.

Number of items, 1916.....	14
Number of items, 1913.....	19
Number of districts.....	21
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$4,027,459

Texas.

Number of items, 1916.....	16
Number of items, 1913.....	28
Number of districts.....	18
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$1,048,277

	Ohio.	Texas.
Villages under 2,000.....		4
Villages under 3,000.....		8
Villages under 4,000.....	3	12
Cities over 5,000.....	10	3

Texas secured 44 items in the last two bills for its 18 districts, while Ohio was parceled out 33 for its 21 districts. Texas pays slightly over 25 per cent of the amount paid by Ohio into the pork-barrel fund. Twelve towns in Texas out of 16 are under 4,000 inhabitants, compared with 3 in Ohio.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JAMES. Does climate have anything to do with the southern appetite for "pork"?

Mr. FREAR. I do not know whether it has in that particular. I think it is the same condition of climate that affects the Brazos and Trinity, and some of the other streams which have acquired quite a reputation for cooling currency down in that part of the country.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman permit me to correct him?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman stated that Ohio had 21 districts; it has 22.

Mr. FREAR. I thank him for the correction. That simply affects the proportion, which becomes greater.

Georgia and Iowa, Maine and New Hampshire (1916 bill).

GEORGIA—19 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Monroe.....	\$30,000	3,020	12
Rossville.....	25,000	1,059	14
Fandersville.....	30,000	2,641	14
Waynesboro.....	25,000	2,729	14
Ashburn.....	5,000	2,214	15
Baxley.....	5,000	1,831	25
Blakely.....	6,000	1,838	25
Calto.....	6,000	1,505	26
Commerce.....	5,000	2,238	26
Covington.....	5,000	2,697	26
Thomaston.....	5,000	1,645	26
Cuthbert.....	6,000	3,210	32
Decatur.....	8,000	2,466	26
East Point.....	8,000	3,682	27
Fort Valley.....	8,000	2,697	27
Fawcettsville.....	8,000	3,420	27
Jackson.....	5,000	1,725	28
Felham.....	6,000	1,645	32
Winder.....	5,000	2,443	33

Georgia and Iowa, Maine and New Hampshire (1916 bill)—Continued.

IOWA—13 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Shenandoah.....	\$14,000	4,976	8
Sioux City.....	335,000	47,828	8
Fairfield.....	50,000	4,970	10
Marvengo.....	30,000	1,786	12
Newton.....	55,000	4,616	13
Oelwein.....	40,000	6,528	13
Algona.....	45,000	2,908	16
Eagle Grove.....	35,000	3,387	17
Harlan.....	35,000	2,570	19
Knoxville.....	40,000	3,190	20
Indianola.....	5,000	3,283	28
Mt. Pleasant.....	7,500	3,874	30

MAINE—4 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Bath.....	\$10,000	9,376	2
Houlton.....	50,000	5,845	5
Farmington.....	45,000	3,210	18
Sanford.....	50,000	9,049	23

NEW HAMPSHIRE—2 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Manchester.....	\$225,000	70,063	7
Claremont.....	55,000	7,529	17

Georgia.

Number of items, 1916.....	19
Number of items, 1913.....	18
Number of districts.....	12
Income tax paid, 1915.....	\$440,601

Three States.

Number of items, 1916.....	13
Number of items, 1913.....	15
Number of districts.....	17
Income tax (also includes Vermont in district).....	\$1,859,031

	Georgia.	Three States.
Villages under 2,000.....	7	2
Villages under 3,000.....	14	4
Villages under 4,000.....	19	9
Cities over 5,000.....	None.	7

Every item in Georgia is for towns under 4,000 inhabitants, and Georgia gets 19 items for its 12 districts compared to the same number of items distributed over three Northern States that contributed four times as much to the Federal Treasury.

Wisconsin and Tennessee (1916 bill).

WISCONSIN—10 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
W. S. Milwaukee.....	\$100,000	373,857	3
Appleton.....	50,000	16,773	4
Kenosha.....	75,000	21,371	6
Grand Rapids.....	70,000	6,521	18
Ladysmith.....	35,000	2,352	20
Portage.....	57,000	5,440	22
Reedsburg.....	40,000	2,615	23
Sturgeon Bay.....	40,000	4,262	23
Menasha.....	10,000	6,081	29
Two Rivers.....	10,000	4,850	32

TENNESSEE—9 ITEMS.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Huntington.....	\$25,000	1,112	11
Rogersville.....	25,000	1,242	14
Brownsville.....	5,000	2,882	26
Dickson.....	5,000	1,850	27
La Follette.....	6,000	2,816	28
Lenoir.....	6,000	3,392	28
Lewisburg.....	5,000	1,830	28
McMinnville.....	5,000	2,299	29
Rockwood.....	6,000	3,660	31

Wisconsin.

Number of items, 1916.....	10
Number of items, 1913.....	12
Number of districts.....	11
Income tax, 1916.....	\$875,352

Tennessee.

Number of items, 1916.....	9
Number of items, 1913.....	13
Number of districts.....	10
Income tax, 1916.....	\$410,203

Wisconsin and Tennessee (1916 bill)—Continued.

	Wisconsin.	Tennessee.
Villages under 2,000.....	4
Villages under 3,000.....	2	7
Villages under 4,000.....	2	9
Cities over 5,000.....	6

The significant part of this comparison bears on the fact that all the Tennessee items are in towns under 4,000 people and 7 out of 9 in towns under 3,000 people. None reach 5,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FREAR. Remember, gentlemen, that this is the 1916 bill that I am discussing, the bill that is before the House at the present time, and which Secretary McAdoo says ought to be defeated.

Continuing, we find—

New York and Missouri, 21 items each (1916 bill).

NEW YORK.

Name.	Appropriation.	Population.	Page.
Long Island City.....	\$100,000	(1)	3
Yonkers.....	51,500	79,803	4
Albany.....	10,000	100,252	4
Plattsburg.....	50,000	11,138	8
Bath.....	50,000	3,884	9
Binghamton.....	500,000	48,443	9
New York Bronx.....	850,000	431,980	9
Lyons.....	40,000	4,460	12
Nyack.....	50,000	4,619	13
Oneida.....	55,000	8,317	13
Canajoharie.....	60,000	2,273	16
Danville.....	60,000	3,938	17
Hlon.....	65,000	6,588	19
Liberty.....	55,000	2,072	20
Mechanicsville.....	55,000	6,634	21
Newburgh.....	140,000	27,805	21
Ticonderoga.....	35,000	2,475	24
Albion.....	10,000	5,016	25
Lowville.....	10,000	2,940	29
Potsdam.....	9,000	4,036	31
Wellsville.....	12,500	4,382	32

MISSOURI.

Columbia.....	\$12,000	9,662	5
Jefferson City.....	50,000	11,850	5
Aurora.....	65,000	3,661	9
Mountain Grove.....	40,000	1,722	13
Trenton.....	65,000	5,656	15
Unionville.....	30,000	2,000	15
West Plains.....	40,000	2,914	15
Bowling Green.....	80,000	1,585	16
Richmond.....	40,000	3,644	23
Edalia.....	210,000	17,822	23
Cameron.....	5,000	2,980	26
Charleston.....	5,000	2,500	26
Eldorado Springs.....	4,000	2,503	27
Kansas City.....	1,000,000	248,381	28
Milan.....	5,000	1,800	29
Neesho.....	5,000	3,661	30
Paris.....	5,000	1,425	30
Perryville.....	5,000	1,708	30
Rich Hill.....	4,000	2,755	31
Salisbury.....	5,000	2,000	31
Windsor.....	4,000	2,241	33

¹Not in census.

New York.

Number of items, 1916.....	21
Number of items, 1913.....	15
Number of districts.....	43
Total income tax paid, 1915.....	\$45,230,685

Missouri.

Number of items, 1916.....	21
Number of items, 1913.....	15
Number of districts.....	16
Total income tax paid, 1915.....	\$2,789,965

	New York.	Missouri.
Villages under 2,000.....	None.	5
Villages under 3,000.....	4	13
Villages under 4,000.....	6	16
Cities over 5,000.....	10	5

The foregoing comparisons have been made to show first that, as stated, crossroads throughout the South are paired off with larger cities in the North. For illustration, Missouri has 16 out of 21 items in towns under 4,000, and 13 items in towns under 3,000. While New York has six and four, respectively. New York contributes \$16 to the Federal Treasury for every dollar paid in by Missouri, but in the race for profligate public-buildings waste Missouri equals its record on waterway appropriations.

Further comparisons can be made to show the sectional character of the bill, but it is submitted that it is immaterial where the waste occurs, whether North or South it should be subject to the same criticism.

The foregoing allotment to States is also presented to indicate the symmetry of the omnibus buildings bill. One of the most significant facts disclosed by the statement relates to the general character of towns, crossroads, and flag stations that are included in the list. Although difficult to compile in the limited time afforded for investigation, I have presented a few comparisons of appropriations given to Northern and Southern States. In the first comparison it may be noted that nine-tenths of the Alabama and three-fourths of the Michigan items would be barred under the requirement urged by Postmaster General Burleson that only cities of 5,000 inhabitants or over be considered, and then only where the post-office receipts exceeded \$15,000 annually and annual rental charge reaches over \$1,000. Such a limit would prevent the passage of any omnibus public-buildings bill, because practically all the projects in Alabama and most of those in Michigan could not qualify. In this single illustration appears the fundamental weakness of providing public buildings by political-pull methods.

A casual examination shows how the same principle has been invoked to provide many southern crossroad towns in other States with Government monuments in order to secure buildings to meet Government needs in northern cities. The comparison speaks for itself. Income-tax comparisons are those collected only from individuals. The total income-tax payments are not at hand, but it is believed they will preserve the same relative difference in amounts.

It has been repeatedly suggested that Representatives owe to their constituencies all they can get for their districts and that their efficiency is so measured. It is further urged that districts generally will reward or punish Representatives according to the proportion of plums secured for their respective districts.

Every Member desires to perform his full duty by and for his district, but the oath of office contemplates public service not circumscribed by congressional district boundaries, nor does it follow that pork-getting proclivities determine public usefulness, popularity, nor estimate of ability held by the average district.

The River and Harbor Committee of 21 members may properly be held to include those who in past years have abundantly cared for their constituencies, yet nearly one-third of that committee, including several of its oldest members, are to be retired by the primaries or election of 1916, indicating that widespread popularity does not necessarily follow the ability to get something for one's district whatever reason determined results.

DISTRICTS PREFER PUBLIC ECONOMY TO LOCAL PORK.

Measured by such token, I would be relegated to private life, because, with 125 miles of the greatest inland rivers in the country bordering on my district, I have repeatedly opposed waterway and other forms of public waste. Possibly this accounts for a statement published during the campaign in one of the leading Democratic papers of my State, that—

The Democratic national committee considers Representative FREAR's district vulnerable, and is preparing to send a half dozen prominent speakers into the district to help the Democratic candidate. * * *

In no other Wisconsin Republican congressional district is the Democratic committee thus concentrating its orators.

Money and speakers were generously shoved into the district by the committee during the recent campaign, in a vigorous effort to carry it. Plum getting, however, is not a necessary asset in the tenth Wisconsin district, which gave about 14,000 majority, or more than double its usual vote in indorsement of its Representative's course, and several thousand more than was given to the head of the ticket. Vulnerability does not ordinarily come through efforts to stop extravagance and waste, otherwise the Democratic national committee would have had something to show for its money and "orators" in this Wisconsin district. What is true of that district is true of the great majority of districts throughout the country where constituencies do not ask Representatives to support dishonest bills as a price for local appropriations.

Apologists for omnibus bills urge that the construction of public buildings by the Government is ordinarily a matter of business economy.

The 1913 public-buildings scandal was put through the House with only 20 minutes allowed for discussion of its four hundred and odd projects. Blindfolded, bound, and gagged, as has been stated. On February 17, 1913, the chairman of the Public Buildings Committee, Mr. CLARK, said:

SENSELESS RETRENCHMENT!

As a Democrat, I believe in retrenchment in Government expenditures, but I believe in some common-sense retrenchment and not in the senseless retrenchment demanded by the yellow journals of the land and the alleged economists in this House.

I want to live to see the day when the Government of the United States will not have a single officer or employee in rented quarters. * * * From a business standpoint I am convinced it will be infinitely cheaper for the Government to own all of the property necessary for the transaction of its business than it will be to pay rent."

On page 8 of the report of the Public Buildings Committee, signed by Chairman CLARK shortly afterwards, appears this statement:

It is recommended that the present law that no building shall be authorized when the post-office receipts are less than \$10,000 per year be continued. In the consideration of each project a comparison of rental value for suitable quarters, together with the cost of maintenance and operation, including interest at 3 per cent on the investment for the building proposed, shall be made in order that it may be determined whether its erection would be a desirable or proper investment.

Again the report, signed by Chairman CLARK, says (p. 8):

A general examination of sites and buildings authorized but not consummated has been made, and the commission is satisfied that some appropriations and authorizations have been made which are not justified. Other authorizations are too large. These authorizations were, it is believed, the result of the present unsatisfactory system of providing for and constructing public buildings.

NO LIMIT TO POST-OFFICE RECEIPTS REQUIRED.

I have quoted the commission's report to show that in the first public-buildings bill offered after the report was made the joke limit law on annual receipts is repeatedly violated, and in the estimates of proposed expense to be incurred the Treasury Department shows that over 80 per cent of the items in the bill, apart from a few improvements on existing buildings, are extravagant and wasteful. These figures conclusively show that it is not "infinitely cheaper for the Government to own all its property for the transaction of its business," but that it is grossly more extravagant and wasteful to establish Government buildings in country crossroads. If 2 and 2 make 4, then the Treasury Department makes an unanswerable argument against Chairman CLARK's 1913 effusion.

If the present system of providing for and constructing public buildings is unsatisfactory, as declared by Chairman CLARK in his Public Buildings Commission's report just quoted, then why not change the scandalous system instead of seeking to put through another notorious bill, worse in character, if that be possible, than any of its predecessors—a bill that reeks with "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation."

That is not a yellow-journal statement, but is conclusively proven by the report of the Treasury Department, the minority report of Gen. Burleson, and, in fact, by the Public Buildings Commission's report signed by Chairman CLARK, because the Treasury Department has analyzed the present and proposed cost on the basis urged by the Clark report, as I desire to show.

Herewith I present a significant analysis of portions of the public-buildings bill furnished by the Treasury Department, wherein is disclosed the large waste that will result to the Government by constructing buildings in hundreds of little towns all over the country. An annual average charge upon the Federal Treasury of between \$3,000 and \$4,000 will be incurred, whereas the cost to the Government under present conditions, according to the report, averages less than 25 per cent of the profligate waste that will be assumed under this bill. It should also be borne in mind that this list only affects a portion of the wasteful projects contained in the 1916 bill:

ANALYSES OF SECTIONS 3, 4, AND 5 OF PUBLIC-BUILDINGS BILL (1916) OF PLACES WHERE POSTAL RECEIPTS ARE LESS THAN \$15,000.

NOTE.—Explanation of analyses of sections 3, 4, and 5 of public-buildings bill of places where postal receipts are less than \$15,000.

"Place" indicates location of proposed building.

"Estimate" is the amount that the department estimated would be the cost of the project at the place named.

"Bill" is the amount provided in the omnibus bill for the place indicated.

"Interest" is the estimated interest on the amount named in said omnibus bill, with furnishing added.

"Depreciation" is the estimated annual depreciation on this same amount less amount paid for site.

"Janitor" and "Supplies" are, respectively, estimated annual cost for janitor service and supplies in each instance.

"Total" is the sum of the four previous columns, namely, "Interest," "Depreciation," "Janitor," and "Supplies."

BUILDINGS ON SITES OWNED OR AUTHORIZED (3).

Place.	Estimate.	Bill.	Interest.	Depreciation.	Janitor.	Supplies.	Total.
Albertville, Ala.	\$30,000	\$25,000	\$990.00	\$630.00	\$960	\$900	\$3,480.00
Attalla, Ala.	25,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Barbourville, Ky.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Brinkley, Ark.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Boysen City, Mich.	35,000	30,000	1,230.00	742.50	960	900	3,832.50
Carlinville, Ill.	45,000	30,000	1,290.00	742.50	960	900	3,892.50
Central City, Ky.	30,000	30,000	1,215.00	742.50	960	900	3,817.50
Coleman, Tex.	50,000	30,000	900.00	742.50	960	900	3,502.50
Conway, Ark.	55,000	40,000	1,350.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,717.50
Crockett, Tex.	45,000	25,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Dillon, S. C.	30,000	25,000	1,065.00	630.00	960	900	3,555.00
Edenton, N. C.	35,000	45,000	1,665.00	1,091.25	960	900	4,616.25
Eldorado, Ark.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Emmence, Ky.	30,000	40,000	1,495.50	967.50	960	900	4,323.00
Falmouth, Ky.	25,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Forest City, Ark.	55,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Georgetown, Tex.	45,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Green River, Wyo.	25,000	25,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Greenville, Ala.	35,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Highland, Ill.	30,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Holton, Kans.	35,000	35,000	1,275.00	855.00	960	900	3,990.00
Huntingdon, Tenn.	25,000	25,000	915.00	630.00	960	900	3,405.00
Huntsville, Tex.	55,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Kissimmee, Fla.	35,000	35,000	1,280.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Lake City, Fla.	50,000	35,000	1,320.00	855.00	960	900	4,035.00
Lenoir, N. C.	35,000	30,000	1,125.00	742.50	960	900	3,727.50
Linton, Ind.	45,000	35,000	1,380.00	855.00	960	900	4,095.00
Lumberton, N. C.	45,000	30,000	1,290.00	742.50	960	900	3,892.50
Madisonville, Ky.	50,000	40,000	1,590.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,717.50
Manchester, Conn.	45,000	40,000	1,650.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,777.50
Marengo, Iowa	30,000	30,000	1,095.00	742.50	960	900	3,697.50
Monroe, Ga.	45,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Mount Airy, N. C.	55,000	55,000	1,890.00	1,305.00	1,200	900	5,355.00
Morgan City, La.	30,000	40,000	1,470.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,597.50
Mountain Grove, Mo.	45,000	40,000	1,515.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,642.50
Mount Olive, N. C.	35,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Mount Vernon, Ind.	55,000	40,000	1,515.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,642.50
Murray, Ky.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Napoleon, Ohio	50,000	35,000	1,365.00	855.00	960	900	4,080.00
Nephi, Utah	30,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Newark, Del.	30,000	30,000	1,110.00	742.50	960	900	3,712.50
Newcastle, Wyo.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
New Martinsville, W. Va.	50,000	40,000	1,635.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,792.50
Pikeville, Ky.	25,000	35,000	1,065.00	630.00	960	900	3,355.00
Provincetown, Mass.	55,000	30,000	1,230.00	742.50	960	900	3,832.50
Rogersville, Tenn.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,420.00
Rossville, Ga.	30,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Sandersville, Ga.	55,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Seguin, Tex.	45,000	30,000	990.00	742.50	960	900	3,592.50
Spring Valley, Ill.	35,000	30,000	1,290.00	742.50	960	900	3,892.50
St. Johns, Ore.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Struttart, Ark.	50,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Sylacauga, Ala.	25,000	30,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Union Springs, Ala.	45,000	25,000	975.00	630.00	960	900	3,465.00
Unionville, Mo.	35,000	30,000	1,215.00	742.50	960	900	3,817.50
Vernilion, S. Dak.	45,000	35,000	1,335.00	855.00	960	900	4,080.00
West Plains, Mo.	35,000	40,000	1,440.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,567.50
West Point, Va.	25,000	25,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,390.00
Waynesboro, Ga.	30,000	25,000	992.00	630.00	960	900	3,452.00
							2,070,000 1,840,000 70,332.50 45,188.75 59,340 53,100 228,241.25

SITES AND BUILDINGS.

Place.	Estimate.	Bill.	Interest.	Depreciation.	Janitor.	Supplies.	Total.
Athens, Ala.	\$50,000	\$35,000	\$1,140.00	\$742.50	\$960	\$900	\$3,742.50
Bowling Green, Mo.	35,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Clare, Mich.	45,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Clearwater, Fla.	40,000	40,000	1,290.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Columbus, Kans.	50,000	50,000	1,590.00	1,080.00	1,200	900	4,630.00
Council Grove, Kans.	50,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Corning, Iowa	50,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Duquesne, Pa.	55,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Eagle Grove, Iowa	65,000	45,000	1,440.00	855.00	1,200	900	4,455.00
East Moline, Ill.	35,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Effingham, Ill.	60,000	45,000	1,440.00	855.00	1,200	900	4,455.00
Farmington, Mass.	55,000	45,000	1,440.00	855.00	1,200	900	4,455.00
Harlan, Iowa	52,000	35,000	1,140.00	697.50	960	900	3,697.50
Hazard, Ky.	30,000	40,000	1,290.00	787.50	960	900	3,937.50
Hood River, Ore.	65,000	60,000	1,890.00	1,192.50	1,200	900	5,242.50
Houma, La.	60,000	50,000	1,590.00	967.50	1,200	900	4,717.50
Keyser, W. Va.	55,000	55,000	1,740.00	1,080.00	1,200	900	4,980.00
Kingsville, Tex.	55,000	40,000	1,290.00	855.00	1,200	900	4,305.00
Knoxville, Iowa	55,000	40,000	1,290.00	855.00	1,200	900	4,305.00
Ladysmith, Wis.	52,000	35,000	1,140.00	697.50	960	900	3,697.50
Lewisburg, W. Va.	82,000	82,000	2,550.00	1,755.00	1,200	900	6,465.00
Litchfield, Minn.	50,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Lufkin, Tex.	55,000	35,000	1,140.00	630.00	960	900	3,630.00
Mansfield, La.	40,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Middletown, Pa.	60,000	65,000	2,040.00	1,192.50	960	900	5,092.50
Maxia, Tex.	51,000	35,000	1,140.00	720.00	960	900	3,720.00
Morgantown, N. C.	61,000	35,000	1,140.00	720.00	960	900	3,720.00
Nanticoke, Pa.	65,000	60,000	1,890.00	967.50	960	900	4,717.50
Norton, Kans.	40,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Pittsfield, Ill.	40,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Plaquemine, La.	35,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Port Clinton, Ohio	51,000	40,000	1,290.00	832.50	960	900	3,892.50
Princeton, W. Va.	55,000	45,000	1,440.00	855.00	1,200	900	4,455.00
Reedsburg, Wis.	55,000	40,000	1,290.00	742.50	960	900	3,892.50
Richmond, Mo.	55,000	40,000	1,290.00	742.50	960	900	3,892.50
Sanford, Me.	66,000	50,000	1,590.00	945.00	1,200	900	4,695.00

SITES AND BUILDINGS—continued.

Place.	Estimate.	Bill.	Interest.	Depreciation.	Janitor.	Supplies.	Total.
Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	50,000	40,000	1,200.00	855.00	960	900	4,003.00
Superior, Nebr.	40,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Ticonderoga, N. Y.	35,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Wadena, Minn.	35,000	35,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
	1,962,500	1,747,000	56,100.00	33,145.00	43,260	36,900	171,405.00

SITES.

Albemarle, N. C.	\$10,000	\$6,000	\$1,620.00	\$1,080.00	\$1,260	\$900	\$4,860.00
Alma, Mich. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,320.00	855.00	960	900	4,035.00
Alvin, Tex.	5,000	7,000	1,500.00	967.50	1,260	900	4,627.50
Anadarko, Okla.	5,000	5,000	1,740.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,092.50
Arcadia, Fla.	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Ashburn, Ga. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Barnberg, S. C. ²	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Baxley, Ga. ²	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Beckley, W. Va. ²	10,000	10,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Berkley Springs, W. Va.	5,000	10,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Blakely, Ga.	3,000	6,000	1,470.00	967.50	960	900	4,297.50
Blytheville, Ark.	10,000	9,000	1,860.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,212.50
Broken Bow, Nebr.	10,000	6,000	1,920.00	1,305.00	1,260	900	5,385.00
Brookville, Pa. ²	10,000	10,000	1,140.00	742.50	1,260	900	4,042.50
Brownsville, Tenn.	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	1,260	900	4,042.50
Cairo, Ga.	5,000	6,000	1,620.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,860.00
Cameron, Mo.	5,000	5,000	1,890.00	1,305.00	1,260	900	5,355.00
Canton, S. Dak.	5,000	6,000	1,620.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,860.00
Charleston, Mo. ²	5,000	6,000	1,620.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,860.00
Clinton, N. C. ¹	3,000	5,000	1,290.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Columbia, Miss. ¹	6,000	5,000	1,290.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Commerce, Ga.	5,000	5,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Conway, S. C.	5,000	3,000	1,290.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Covington, Ga.	5,000	5,000	1,290.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Cuthbert, Ga. ¹	5,000	6,000	1,340.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,355.00
David City, Nebr.	5,000	6,000	1,340.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,355.00
Decatur, Ga.	8,000	8,000	1,530.00	967.50	960	900	4,357.50
Dickson, Tenn.	5,000	5,000	1,440.00	967.50	960	900	4,267.50
Duncan, Okla. ²	5,000	5,000	1,440.00	967.50	960	900	4,267.50
Dunn, N. C.	8,000	7,000	1,500.00	967.50	960	900	4,327.50
Easley, S. C. ²	5,000	5,000	1,500.00	967.50	960	900	4,327.50
East Palestine, Ohio.	10,000	7,500	1,680.00	1,080.00	660	900	4,320.00
East Point, Ga.	10,000	8,000	1,680.00	1,080.00	960	900	4,620.00
Eaton Rapids, Mich. ²	7,500	7,500	1,680.00	1,080.00	960	900	4,620.00
Eldorado Springs, Mo. ²	5,000	5,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Ely, Nev. ²	5,000	6,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Essex, Conn.	10,000	10,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Franklin, Ind. ²	5,000	5,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Greer, S. C. ²	5,000	3,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Hartsville, S. C. ¹	5,000	8,000	1,680.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,920.00
Hawkinsville, Ga.	10,000	5,000	990.00	630.00	960	900	3,480.00
Henderson, Tex.	5,000	5,000	1,590.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,830.00
Hickman, Ky.	5,000	5,000	1,440.00	1,080.00	960	900	4,380.00
Indianola, Iowa	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Jackson, Ga.	5,000	6,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
La Follette, Tenn. ²	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Las Vegas, Nev. ²	5,000	10,000	1,290.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,305.00
Lawrenceburg, Ind.	5,000	6,000	1,740.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,092.50
Lenoir City, Tenn. ²	5,000	5,000	1,740.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,092.50
Lewisburg, Tenn.	5,000	5,000	1,740.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,092.50
Lewistown, Ill. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,740.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,092.50
Lexington, Miss. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,740.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,092.50
Lockhart, Tex. ²	5,000	6,000	1,890.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,242.50
Louisburg, N. C.	10,000	10,000	1,740.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,980.00
Lowville, N. Y.	10,000	10,000	1,740.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,980.00
Manning, S. C. ²	5,000	5,000	1,740.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,980.00
Mannington, W. Va. ²	10,000	10,000	1,740.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,980.00
Marion, N. C.	5,000	5,000	1,590.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,830.00
McMinnville, Tenn.	5,000	5,000	1,590.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,830.00
Midland, Pa.	8,500	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Milan, Mo. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Monticello, Fla. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Okaloosa, Miss. ²	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
O'Neill, Nebr.	10,000	6,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Paris, Mo. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Pascagoula, Miss. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Pelham, Ga.	5,000	6,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Perry, Fla. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Perryville, Mo. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,020.00	630.00	960	900	3,510.00
Pineville, Ky.	6,000	5,000	1,290.00	855.00	960	900	4,005.00
Placerville, Cal.	7,000	10,000	1,950.00	1,305.00	1,260	900	5,415.00
Plymouth, Pa.	23,000	15,000	1,740.00	967.50	1,260	900	4,867.50
Ponca City, Okla.	5,000	7,500	1,665.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,905.00
Rich Hill, Mo. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,665.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,905.00
Rockwood, Tenn. ²	5,000	6,000	1,665.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,905.00
Russellville, Ky. ²	10,000	10,000	1,665.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,905.00
Salisbury, Mo. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,665.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,905.00
San Benito, Tex.	5,000	6,000	1,470.00	967.50	1,260	900	4,597.50
Sanford, N. C.	5,000	7,000	1,650.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,890.00
Seward, Nebr.	5,000	6,000	1,320.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,335.00
Sheffield, Ala. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,320.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,335.00
Stanford, Ky. ²	5,000	5,000	1,320.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,335.00
Summersville, S. C. ¹	5,000	5,000	1,320.00	855.00	1,260	900	4,335.00
Susanville, Cal.	5,000	10,000	1,740.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,980.00
Van Buren, Ark.	5,000	6,000	1,620.00	1,080.00	1,260	900	4,860.00
Venice, Cal.	10,000	10,000	1,890.00	1,192.50	1,260	900	5,242.50
Waurika, Okla.	7,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Williamston, N. C.	5,000	5,000	1,140.00	742.50	960	900	3,742.50
Winder, Ga.	5,000	5,000	1,590.00	1,080.00	960	900	4,530.00
Winfield, La.	5,000	5,000	1,440.00	967.50	960	900	4,267.50
Winona, Miss.	5,000	7,500	1,215.00	742.50	960	900	3,817.50

¹ No estimate as to cost of building in detail.² No estimate made.

SITES—continued.

Place.	Estimate.	Bill.	Interest.	Depreciation.	Janitor.	Supplies.	Total.
York, S. C.	5,000	9,000	1,410.00	855.00	960	900	4,125.00
Yuma, Ariz.	6,000	6,000	1,410.00	855.00	960	900	5,500.00
	434,500	581,000	75,590	49,342.50	56,760	45,900	292,592.50

¹ This total is not the sum of the previous columns of interest, depreciation, janitor, and supplies, for the reason that in 18 of the places named certain estimates were made as to the probable cost of upkeep for buildings which it was presumed would eventually be constructed on the sites only which the bills provided for. In these cases no estimates were made on buildings, as none were contemplated in the bills. The total of these 18 places amounts to \$65,000, which, deducted from the above total, leaves a balance of \$227,592.50, which is the total of the columns named where buildings were estimated upon.

In order to show the carnival of waste covered by the 1916 public-buildings bill introduced by Chairman CLARK on behalf of the committee I have just presented this significant analysis of items, reaching nearly 200 in number, wherein an official estimate has been prepared of the probable annual carrying charges of public buildings in the towns named.

The sites and buildings of 100 of these items furnish an initial cost of between four and five million dollars, although the sites for the first 59 items do not appear in the totals. Under our covering-up style of dribbling appropriations these 59 sites have already been bought in jerk-water crossroads and Jim Crow towns scattered all over the continent. It is probable that not one in a dozen of these vacant sites could be resold for one-half the amount paid by Uncle Samuel. For that reason earnest protests are encountered against abandoning any wasteful project or in refusing to erect buildings wherever located, now that a site has been purchased.

We are in the position of Pat's well-remembered preparedness. All that he needed in order to secure a smoke was the loan of a pipe and a little tobacco; he had the match. We have the sites for the first 59 items. Over \$2,000,000 will be spent on the buildings on these sites, according to the appropriations, and then some.

ENORMOUSLY WASTEFUL MAINTENANCE CHARGES.

The original cost is not the most extravagant part of this public-buildings program. The Public Buildings Commission included some of the ablest authorities in the country, and with them was associated the present chairman of the Public Buildings Committee, Representative CLARK. That commission found in its report that the highest rental paid by the Government for any one of the 508 post offices having over \$10,000 annual receipts and occupying leased quarters was \$2,580 and the lowest annual rental \$151. At 378 offices the rental is less than \$1,000 annually, while for 4,320 post offices of all classes and branches the average annual rental in 1913 was \$824. It will also be remembered that many of the "Government monuments" proposed in this public-buildings bill are for towns where the receipts are far below \$10,000 annually, and in some cases do not reach half that amount. A large majority of the buildings are for cities of less than 5,000 inhabitants, and 90 per cent presumably are to be in towns where the rental is less than \$1,000 annually.

The 59 public buildings first named in the last analysis herewith presented will make an annual burden upon the Treasury of \$228,241 for buildings alone, or an average of \$3,868 for each separate item. In 1913 the average rental for 4,320 post offices reached \$824, so that if that average was reached in the 59 projects first named an average increase of over \$3,000, or a profligate waste of over 350 per cent will be recorded. Expressed differently it means jumping a total rental on these 59 items, based on a \$824 average, from \$48,616 to \$228,241 annually. In a short time this item of waste will overtake the original cost of construction because it is a continuing burden.

The analysis of comparative cost of the first 59 items also applies to the remaining items set forth in the last statement, which in all presumably carries an increased annual carrying charge of over a half million dollars apart from the original investment for "Government monuments." Have I made this plain? A brief examination of the bill, aided by these tabulated statements, will reveal the character of "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation," which is proposed by an administration which in 1912 so vociferously denounced extravagance.

WHERE IS THE MONEY COMING FROM TO MEET SUCH EXTRAVAGANCES?

A word of warning to our Democratic friends. You are appropriating lavishly from a depleted Treasury. Under present conditions you are doubly taxing incomes in an effort to save your face financially.

Your chief prophet and spellbinder, who once pledged his candidate to only one presidential term, now predicts that prohibition shall become nation wide. I am speaking only of the financial side of the problem of running a Government when I remind you that approximately \$250,000,000 of annual receipts used for meeting Federal expenditures comes from license or excise fees. What do you propose to do with such profligate waste bills as this public-building scandal, when, after scraping the bottom of the Federal Treasury to meet the waste of 1916, you now are providing for more private waterway waste, more private-land reclamation grabs, more public-buildings waste, and other schemes of like character. Practically one-third of the net revenue of the Government may be forfeited by the Treasury in a loss of excise fees. Many States throughout the country have already declared for State-wide prohibition, thereby reducing present Government license fees. We can not blind ourselves to the trend of public sentiment. Based strictly on the financial aspect of the case how can we stupidly continue to vote for these public-building and sectional-waterway grafts in view of the present and prospective condition of the Federal Treasury? Leaving out of consideration the vice that lays at the foundation of such omnibus bills and the potent influence exercised over other legislation by such public scandals, how can we close our eyes to the imperative necessity of lopping off "profligate waste" disclosed in the bill before us?

Mr. Speaker, when the omnibus river and harbor bill was opposed because of its inherent vice and waste, I offered a constructive measure, which I trust will receive consideration by the next Congress. Had the fortunes of politics given to the Republican Party the reins of power I am sure some such measure would have found favor, because that party was pledged to a budget system of which the proposed waterway bill could have been made a comprehensive and economical part. In addition it would give an impetus to actual inland-waterway navigation, providing its recommendations were followed. That waterway bill offers a genuine constructive program for all those who sincerely desire improvement of actual navigation. It removes pork appropriations from waterways but gives what the country has a right to demand, value received for waterway expenditures.

No criticism is of material service unless some constructive proposal is offered as a substitute. I am not ambitious to provide such a measure for public buildings, and realize that every obstacle to any change will be interposed by genuine lovers of political plums. However, I can not believe the people of the country are willing to be flimflammed much longer by such vicious, extravagant bills, and with the purpose of presenting a tentative measure that will insure needed public buildings and avoid local grabbing at public expense, I submit the following:

A BILL (NO. 18450) PROVIDING FOR A PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION.

A commission composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General is hereby created whose duty it shall be to receive and investigate all applications for Government public buildings wherever located. The commission may provide rules concerning the size of communities, post-office receipts, and rental paid by the Government in determining where public buildings are to be constructed, and shall determine the character, cost, and plans of every public building.

The commission shall annually prepare a report of its findings and recommendations and the same shall be embodied in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Postmaster General. The amounts required to provide for the purchase of sites, construction of buildings, and purchase of needed equipment shall be included and made a part of the regular supply bills submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.

In addition to the analyses already submitted, a further statement of facts is offered relative to conditions surrounding the 400 different projects included in the proposed 1916 public-buildings bill.

A bare statement of facts herein contained is enough to condemn the bill, and I ask its careful consideration by those who are called upon to vote for or against the bill's passage.

PROFLIGATE WASTE VERSUS RETRENCHMENT.

Never in the history of this country have conditions generally called for greater public economy. No sane man is deceived by the present fictitious national prosperity created by foreign conditions, and never before has the necessity for public retrenchment been more imperative.

We are confronted by a depleted Treasury, by oppressive taxes never before equaled in times of peace, by burdensome appropriations for legitimate Government needs and public defense. Then by what right do we approve notoriously wasteful and extravagant bills? I have performed what I believe to be a duty in opposing this bill. Needless to say, it is a disagreeable task and, I realize, will invite protests from those who have

important measures contained in the pending bill. Public improvements are necessary and they should be carried on without hindrance, but this does not justify criminal waste in order to build Government monuments at hundreds of crossroads throughout the country. Let us exercise a small part of the economy and business judgment which men employ in the conduct of business enterprises. Place such public improvements in the hands of reputable officials connected with the administration responsible for expenditures and we will reach an end of extravagance and pork-barrel scandals.

Based on ordinarily good business judgment, I offer a further statement concerning the 1916 public-buildings bill which without argument is sufficient to condemn 80 per cent of the items contained in this bill. Is it any exaggeration to say that one-half of the \$35,000,000 appropriation provided by the bill is unparalleled extravagance and "profligate waste wrung from the people by oppressive taxation."

Sites only (1916 bill).

City and amount.	Population.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Albemarle, N. C., \$6,000.....	2,116	\$8,759.99	\$606
Albion, N. Y., \$10,000.....	5,016	18,169.35	904
Alma, Mich., \$5,000.....	2,757	15,658.26	660
Alvin, Tex., \$6,000.....	1,453	9,051.14	100
Anadarko, Okla., \$7,000.....	3,439	10,894.26	540
Arcadia, Fla., \$5,000.....	1,736	14,564.39	500
Ashburn, Ga., \$5,000.....	2,214	6,468.82	480
Bamberg, S. C., \$5,000.....	1,937	4,257.77	220
Bartlesville, Okla., \$15,000.....	6,181	37,892.21	1,560
Baxley, Ga., \$5,000.....	831	6,639.50	408
Beckley, W. Va., \$10,000.....	2,161	9,305.50	600
Berkeley Springs, W. Va., \$10,000.....	864	6,485.23	450
Bisbee, Ariz., \$25,000.....	9,019	33,250.32	1,480
Blakely, Ga., \$6,000.....	1,838	6,327.50	None.
Blytheville, Ark., \$9,000.....	3,849	11,683.91	560
Boston, Mass., \$1,500,000.....	670,585	8,069,113.07	23,600

Only three of the foregoing items could be built with profit to the Government, according to Burleson.

City and amount.	Population.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Broken Bow, Nebr., \$6,000.....	2,260	\$11,948.10	\$1,600
Brookville, Pa., \$10,000.....	3,003	14,742.57	710
Brownsville, Tenn., \$5,000.....	2,882	8,111.42	660
Cairo, Ga., \$6,000.....	1,505	7,273.48	None.
Cameron, Mo., \$5,000.....	2,080	10,330.11	1,056
Canton, S. Dak., \$6,000.....	2,103	10,006.24	810
Charleston, Mo., \$5,000.....	3,144	9,346.62	500
Clinton, N. C., \$5,000.....	1,101	6,254.73	480
Columbia, Miss., \$5,000.....	2,029	8,505.15	660
Columbus, Ohio, \$240,000.....	181,511	1,139,149.32	(?) 1,980
Commerce, Ga., \$5,000.....	2,238	6,290.89	500
Conway, S. C., \$3,000.....	1,228	6,030.89	490
Corvallis, Oreg., \$10,000.....	4,552	27,479.83	1,404
Covington, Ga., \$5,000.....	2,697	7,031.21	400
Cuthbert, Ga., \$6,000.....	3,210	7,813.40	600

Only 1 or, at most, 2 of the last 15 items meet Mr. Burleson's requirements. The others are wasteful and extravagant from the Government's business point of view. In this Burleson is sustained by Treasury estimates heretofore quoted.

City and amount	Population.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
David City, Nebr., \$6,000.....	2,177	\$11,990.90	\$780
Decatur, Ga., \$3,000.....	2,466	7,230.65	600
Detroit, Mich., \$1,250,000.....	465,766	3,292,227.62	None.
Dickson, Tenn., \$5,000.....	1,850	7,451.91	425
Doylestown, Pa., \$5,000.....	3,304	15,471.81	1,100
Duncan, Okla., \$5,000.....	2,477	8,042.36	480
Dunn, N. C., \$7,000.....	1,823	9,252.97	500
Easley, S. C., \$5,000.....	2,983	5,342.35	300
East Palestine, Ohio, \$7,500.....	3,537	14,043.55	800
East Point, Ga., \$8,000.....	3,682	11,425.61	400
Eaton Rapids, Mich., \$7,500.....	2,094	8,985.23	800
Eldorado Springs, Mo., \$5,000.....	2,503	7,626.21	390
Ely, Nev., \$5,000.....	2,055	8,315.16	900
Essex, Conn., \$6,000.....	2,745	8,087.39	240

Just 1 item in the last 14 noted meets the minimum of population, receipts, and rental urged by Mr. Burleson when the Government's business interests are considered. His estimates have been questioned by those who insist the limits are too low and ought to be raised. By the Treasury estimates they are too small by half, as heretofore shown.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Flagstaff, Ariz., \$7,000.....	1,633	\$15,850.55	\$1,680
Fort Valley, Ga., \$8,000.....	2,097	10,408.97	660
Franklin, Ind., \$10,000.....	4,502	12,920.99	660
Gallion, Ohio, \$15,000.....	7,214	24,930.60	1,020
Greer, S. C., \$5,000.....	1,673	6,643.48	360
Hartsville, S. C., \$3,000.....	2,365	9,884.33	480
Hawkinsville, Ga., \$8,000.....	3,420	8,129.91	772
Henderson, Tex., \$5,000.....	Not given.	6,666.76	300
Hickman, Ky., \$5,000.....	2,736	8,538.80	520
Indianola, Iowa, \$5,000.....	3,283	11,348.49	660
Indianola, Miss., \$5,000.....	1,098	7,661.88	450
Jackson, Ga., \$5,000.....	1,862	6,647.65	340
Kansas City, Mo., \$1,000,000.....	248,381	2,897,325.00	425
Lafollette, Tenn., \$6,000.....	2,816	5,425.91	

Two of the foregoing 14 items meet the limits urged by Burleson for profitable buildings. The rest are wasteful. Think of Greer, Indianola (Miss.), Jackson, and other items, all of which are included in the 1916 bill.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Las Vegas, Nev., \$5,000.....	945	\$7,198.68	None.
Lawrenceburg, Ind., \$10,000.....	3,930	13,367.26	\$900
Lenoir City, Tenn., \$6,000.....	3,392	5,986.59	500
Lewisburg, Pa., \$10,000.....	3,081	15,203.71	1,087
Lewisburg, Tenn., \$5,000.....	1,830	9,430.44	380
Lewistown, Ill., \$5,000.....	2,312	7,816.41	540
Lexington, Miss., \$5,000.....	2,428	8,421.84	600
Little Rock, Ark., \$175,000.....	45,941	345,986.12	5,193
Lockhart, Tex., \$6,000.....	2,945	10,617.08	660
Louisburg, N. C., \$6,000.....	1,775	8,128.04	600
Lowville, N. Y., \$10,000.....	2,940	14,307.29	1,050
Manning, S. C., \$5,000.....	1,854	5,435.28	350
Mannington, W. Va., \$10,000.....	2,672	12,340.00	1,346
Marion, N. C., \$6,000.....	1,519	8,315.52	924
McMinnville, Tenn., \$5,000.....	2,299	8,724.74	540

Only 1 of the last 15 items can profitably be considered by the Government, according to Mr. Burleson. "Government monuments" in crossroads from Nevada to North Carolina are provided in the 1916 bill.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Menasha, Wis., \$10,000.....	6,081	\$16,671.44	\$864
Midland, Pa., \$5,000.....	1,244	10,619.45	300
Milan, Mo., \$5,000.....	2,191	6,684.48	500
Montgomery, Ala., \$175,000.....	38,136	191,567.19	1,980
Monticello, Fla., \$5,000.....	1,829	6,065.70	600
Mount Pleasant, Iowa, \$7,500.....	3,874	16,094.48	600
Neosho, Mo., \$5,000.....	3,661	28,524.15	924
Norman, Okla., \$7,000.....	3,724	17,904.49	936
Okolona, Miss., \$5,000.....	2,684	5,425.40	480
O'Neill, Nebr., \$6,000.....	2,089	8,924.77	720
Oswego, Kans., \$5,000.....	2,317	15,166.97	884
Ozark, Ala., \$5,000.....	2,229	6,416.74	400
Paris, Mo., \$5,000.....	1,474	7,037.89	540
Pascagoula, Miss., \$5,000.....	3,379	6,179.94	514
Pelham, Ga., \$6,000.....	1,880	6,719.12	None.

Only 1 item in the last 15 meets limits fixed by Mr. Burleson for profitable or excusable construction by the Government. In this judgment he is sustained by Treasury estimates which have been presented, of carrying charges after buildings have been erected.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Perry, Fla., \$5,000.....	1,012	\$6,439.25	\$360
Perryville, Mo., \$5,000.....	1,708	5,662.91	400
Philadelphia, Pa., \$750,000.....	1,549,008	8,029,545.51
Pineville, Ky., \$5,000.....	2,161	7,369.33	600
Placerville, Cal., \$10,000.....	1,914	10,088.38	1,617
Plymouth, Pa., \$15,000.....	16,996	12,776.20	1,096
Ponca City, Okla., \$7,500.....	2,521	12,283.13	840
Potsdam, N. Y., \$9,000.....	4,036	19,320.22	780
Redlands, Cal., \$30,000.....	10,449	40,527.68	811
Rich Hill, Mo., \$5,000.....	2,755	7,831.80	480
Rockwood, Tenn., \$6,000.....	3,660	5,857.91	360
Russellville, Ky., \$10,000.....	3,111	7,898.31	448
Salisbury, Mo., \$5,000.....	1,834	7,438.25	500
San Benito, Tex., \$6,000.....	Not given.	8,199.12	180
Sanford, N. C., \$7,000.....	2,282	9,568.04	500

Just 2, or at most 3, of the last 15 items are in the class rated as profitable to the Government. Perry's victory over the

British has nothing on the Florida Perry's capture of Congress. San Benito, with \$180 rental, will be increased over 2,000 per cent before the annual cost of the proposed monument is completed.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
San Jose, Cal., \$15,000.....	28,946	\$143,972.60	\$480
San Mateo, Cal., \$15,000.....	4,884	17,909.63	900
Santa Monica, Cal., \$15,000.....	7,847	41,139.36	1,096
Seward, Nebr., \$6,000.....	2,106	10,191.59	900
Sheffield, Ala., \$5,000.....	1,865	7,968.77	660
Stanford, Ky., \$5,000.....	1,532	6,228.48	396
Stillwater, Okla., \$7,000.....	3,444	15,591.84	996
Summersville, S. C., \$5,000.....	2,355	7,796.61	440
Susanville, Cal., \$10,000.....	6,688	7,058.08	360
Thomaston, Ga., \$5,000.....	1,645	6,144.63	360
Two Rivers, Wis., \$10,000.....	4,850	13,728.86	584
Van Buren, Ark., \$6,000.....	3,878	9,884.36	1,060
Venice, Cal., \$10,000.....	Not given.	13,501.77	1,120
Waurika, Okla., \$5,000.....	2,928	6,480.82	420
Wellsville, N. Y., \$12,500.....	4,382	21,834.16	815

Two only of the last 15 items can be justified, according to Mr. Burleson. In all others the population, receipts, and rental do not warrant public buildings. This does not deter Susanville's 688 souls from making their demand for a \$10,000 site, "Profligate waste," thy name is Susanville.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Westboro, Mass., \$15,000.....	(1)	\$14,552.31	\$1,275
West Palm Beach, Fla., \$10,000.....	1,743	25,850.58	2,866
Whitinsville, Mass., \$10,000.....	(1)	10,597.37	800
Wichita, Kans., \$75,000.....	52,450	331,003.87	1,380
Williamston, N. C., \$5,000.....	1,574	6,043.18	300
Winder, Ga., \$5,000.....	2,443	7,317.19	406
Windsor, Ga., \$4,000.....	2,241	7,918.08	600
Winfield, La., \$5,000.....	2,925	9,098.12	380
Winona, Miss., \$7,500.....	2,512	8,584.35	460
York, S. C., \$9,000.....	2,326	8,596.98	600
Yuma, Ariz., \$6,000.....	2,914	14,038.77	680

¹ Not listed.

Wichita and possibly one or two others qualify under Mr. Burleson's estimate of justified building at Government expense, but in order to get through the bill needs the vote of Representatives interested in Government monuments that are to be built in Williamston and on down to Yuma. That is the vice of omnibus or pork-barrel legislation.

Miscellaneous.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Utica, N. Y., \$365,000 (sec. 6).....	74,419	\$333,996.11
Malden, Mass., \$150,000 (sec. 8).....	44,404	79,932.65	\$2,500
Nogales, Ariz., \$120,000 (sec. 17).....	(1910) 2,000	13,915.57	2,398
Dallas, Tex., \$550,000 (sec. 18).....	92,104	1,070,751.49	3,000
Rock Hill, S. C., \$125,000 (sec. 19).....	7,216	23,957.34	2,400
Newark, N. J., \$600,000 (sec. 20).....	347,469	1,410,925.67	7,086
Okmulgee, Okla., \$135,000 (sec. 21).....	4,176	25,645.80	1,464
Pittsburgh, Pa., \$50,000 (sec. 22).....	533,905	3,457,149.06	12,550
Atlantic City, N. J., \$60,000 (sec. 25).....	16,773	62,818.91	3,700

Sites and buildings.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Algona, Iowa, \$45,000.....	2,908	\$15,210.44	\$800
Athens, Ala., \$35,000.....	1,715	9,393.82	508
Blackfoot, Idaho, \$65,000.....	2,202	18,414.45	1,468
Bloomington, Ill., \$150,000.....	25,768	122,227.54	None.
Bowling Green, Mo., \$35,000.....	1,585	8,923.57	780
Bristol, Va., \$80,000.....	6,247	45,283.59	1,500
Canajoharie, N. Y., \$60,000.....	2,273	25,913.58	848
Carbondale, Ill., \$60,000.....	5,411	15,980.68	996
Clare, Mich., \$35,000.....	1,350	8,590.91	509
Claremont, N. H., \$55,000.....	7,529	22,856.10	1,060
Circleville, Ohio, \$65,000.....	6,744	17,505.63	860
Clearwater, Fla., \$40,000.....	1,171	10,959.77	1,080
Columbus, Kans., \$50,000.....	3,064	13,279.63	684
Council Grove, Kans., \$35,000.....	2,545	9,141.27	540
Corning, Iowa, \$35,000.....	1,702	7,133.25	660

Beginning with Algona, only 2 or possibly 3 of the last 15 items can be profitably built by the Government, according to Burleson. His statement is verified by Treasury officials.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Dansville, N. Y., \$60,000.	3,938	\$46,034.18	\$1,100
De Ridder, La., \$30,000.	2,100	8,854.54	300
Dodge City, Kans., \$60,000.	3,214	21,246.73	1,680
Duquesne, Pa., \$75,000.	15,727	13,740.49	1,020
Eagle Grove, Iowa, \$35,000.	3,387	11,625.90	775
East Moline, Ill., \$45,000.	2,665	14,252.47	576
Easton, Md., \$65,000.	3,083	20,732.09	1,480
Eaton, Ohio, \$35,000.	3,187	11,290.79	480
Effingham, Ill., \$45,000.	3,898	12,693.76	1,170
Elko, Nev., \$50,000.	1,677	22,255.66	2,720
Everett, Mass., \$115,000.	33,484	(¹)
Farmington, Me., \$45,000.	3,210	11,924.96	936
Fort Wayne, Ind., \$550,000.	63,933	323,056.53	960
Fort Worth, Tex., \$600,000.	73,312	411,999.85	2,500
Framingham, Mass., \$100,000.	12,948	\$84,899.01	\$2,955
Galva, Ill., \$45,000.	2,498	15,691.44	450
Gardner, Mass., \$90,000.	14,699	32,795.95	1,500
Grand Rapids, Wis., \$70,000.	6,521	27,973.83	995
Great Barrington, Mass., \$50,000.	5,926	18,372.93	900
Greenville, Pa., \$75,000.	5,909	31,245.42	1,380
Greenwood, S. C., \$125,000.	6,614	23,297.36	None.
Harlan, Iowa, \$35,000.	2,570	11,809.90	960
Hartford City, Ind., \$50,000.	6,187	15,983.64	650
Harvey, Ill., \$55,000.	7,227	22,288.35	902
Hazard, Ky., \$40,000.	537	4,488.43	250
Hood River, Oreg., \$60,000.	2,331	12,455.41	1,020
Houlihan, Wash., \$75,000.	8,171	23,230.21	2,580
Houma, La., \$50,000.	5,024	12,095.41	900
Hugo, Okla., \$58,000.	4,582	16,275.38	950

The last few items reach a higher average. But what shall be said of such items as Hazard, where the annual charge against the Government of \$250 will be increased to \$3,937, according to Treasury authorities, when we have constructed a Government monument in Hazard and at a per capita cost of \$56 to the Government? There are many others.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Ilion, N. Y., \$65,000.	6,588	\$25,409.50	\$1,020
Junction City, Kans., \$55,000.	5,598	17,777.05	900
Keyser, W. Va., \$55,000.	3,705	13,733.39	840
Kingsville, Tex., \$40,000.	(²)	13,261.14	480
Knoxville, Iowa, \$40,000.	3,100	11,182.11	600
Ladysmith, Wis., \$35,000.	2,350	10,304.29	360
Lansdowne, Pa., \$65,000.	4,066	25,667.33	1,080
Lewisburg, W. Va., \$82,000.	803	8,017.37	540
Lewistown, Mont., \$100,000.	2,992	42,862.76	3,900
Liberty, N. Y., \$55,000.	2,072	17,948.57	912
Litchfield, Minn., \$35,000.	2,333	12,368.58	740
Ludington, Mich., \$75,000.	9,132	27,069.41	1,736
Lufkin, Tex., \$35,000.	2,749	12,026.45	660
Mansfield, La., \$35,000.	1,799	11,192.23	1,000
Marshall, Mich., \$75,000.	4,236	62,763.35	1,350
Mechanicsville, N. Y., \$55,000.	6,634	17,757.39	952
Middletown, Pa., \$65,000.	5,374	14,468.46	1,104
Mexia, Tex., \$35,000.	2,694	10,500.86	585
Morgantown, N. C., \$35,000.	2,712	10,211.35	660
Mount Vernon, Ohio, \$70,000.	9,087	30,729.19	1,650
Nanticoke, Pa., \$60,000.	18,877	13,325.70	924
Newburgh, N. Y., \$140,000.	27,805	91,896.74	None.
New Orleans, La., quarantine station, \$500,000.	339,075	1,248,603.25
Northfield, Minn., \$51,000.	3,265	21,099.96	1,100
Norton, Kans., \$35,000.	1,787	9,398.69	450
Norwalk, Conn., \$140,000.	24,211	27,246.60	960
Norwalk, Ohio, \$65,000.	7,858	28,659.16	1,890
Olathe, Kans., \$55,000.	3,272	15,919.25	1,320
Oregon City, Oreg., \$70,000.	4,287	20,334.08	2,064
Painesville, Ohio, \$70,000.	5,501	41,738.05	1,160

Less than half of the foregoing items meet the requirement urged by Mr. Burleson as to population, receipts, and rent. The annual cost of a \$70,000-structure averages over \$4,000, according to the Treasury authorities. On that basis not 10 per cent would be profitable investments for the Government.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Peabody, Mass., \$100,000.	15,721	\$25,130.96	\$1,375
Peru, Ill., \$45,000.	7,984	16,247.75	708
Petaluma, Cal., \$60,000.	5,880	32,348.61	1,610
Phillipsburg, Pa., \$60,000.	3,585	17,016.64	1,144
Phillipsburg, N. J., \$60,000.	13,903	24,243.33	1,320
Pittsfield, Ill., \$35,000.	2,095	11,289.17	750
Plainview, Tex., \$45,000.	2,829	16,330.20	600
Plaquemine, La., \$35,000.	4,955	11,437.05	300
Portage, Wis., \$57,000.	5,440	20,372.61	1,060
Port Clinton, Ohio, \$40,000.	3,007	12,785.02	550
Princeton, W. Va., \$45,000.	3,027	10,252.84	234
Reedsburg, Wis., \$40,000.	2,615	11,840.82	590
Richmond, Mo., \$40,000.	3,664	10,088.02	880
Salem, Mass., \$130,000.	43,697	136,500.08	4,200
Sanford, Me., \$50,000.	9,049	13,837.02	872
Sapulpa, Okla., \$70,000.	8,283	25,803.09	601
Seattle, Wash., improve station, \$275,000.	237,194	1,388,571.99
Sedalia, Mo., \$210,000.	17,822	61,850.42

¹ Included in Boston.

² Not included in census of 1910.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Silver City, N. Mex., \$60,000.	3,217	\$16,518.95	\$1,720
Somerset, Pa., \$58,000.	2,612	16,076.75	1,072
Staunton, Va., \$85,000.	10,604	47,023.77	120
St. Johns, Mich., \$55,000.	3,154	15,792.43	996
Sturgeon Bay, Wis., \$40,000.	4,262	11,320.89	555
Superior, Nebr., \$35,000.	2,106	11,495.82	900
Thief River Falls, Minn., \$55,000.	3,714	20,630.66	600
Ticonderoga, N. Y., \$35,000.	2,475	11,513.32	710
Vinita, Okla., \$100,000.	4,082	17,817.53	1,244
Wadena, Minn., \$35,000.	1,820	11,267.23	780
Wakefield, Mass., \$65,000.	11,404	21,469.26	960
Weehawken, N. J., \$125,000.	11,228	82,857.54	1,432
Winsted, Conn., \$60,000.	7,754	29,672.37	1,940

Although the average has improved among the recent items, it has not been large enough to excuse over half of the items which fall to reach the limits urged by Mr. Burleson or the limit of profitable construction shown by Treasury officials. In fact, the future expense of 90 per cent of the structures will cost the Government approximately 300 per cent increase, according to Treasury estimates.

Buildings on sites owned or authorized.

SECTION 3.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Albertville, Ala., \$25,000.	1,544	\$5,663.04	\$500.00
Alva, Okla., \$45,000.	3,688	15,833.05	624.00
Attalia, Ala., \$30,000.	2,513	4,610.21	460.00
Aurora, Mo., \$65,000.	4,148	51,210.15	720.00
Barbourville, Ky., \$25,000.	1,633	4,532.95	406.00
Bath, N. Y., \$50,000.	3,884	24,992.62	1,220.00
Benton Harbor, Mich., \$80,000.	9,185	54,702.56	2,000.00
Binghamton, N. Y., \$500,000.	48,443	281,439.83	8,840.00
Brinkley, Ark., \$25,000.	1,740	6,114.53	550.00
Bronx, N. Y., \$850,000.	431,980	168,601.06	8,698.58
Boyer City, Mich., \$30,000.	5,218	11,063.17	762.00
Canon City, Colo., \$55,000.	5,162	23,383.58	1,600.00
Carlinville, Ill., \$30,000.	3,616	12,566.28	660.00
Central City, Ky., \$30,000.	2,545	5,707.92	500.00
Coleman, Tex., \$30,000.	3,046	10,723.84	876.00
Conway, Ark., \$40,000.	2,794	13,126.17	644.00
Crockett, Tex., \$25,000.	3,947	7,801.03	632.00

The average is smaller and the profligate waste greater when only 5 out of 17 items reach the limit urged by Mr. Burleson and Treasury officials. Only two pass the Treasury estimates.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Decatur, Ind., \$45,000.	4,471	\$17,009.73	\$1,420
Dillon, S. C., \$25,000.	1,757	7,733.63	400
Duluth, Minn., \$300,000.	78,466	429,124.11	2,740
Edenton, N. C., \$45,000.	2,789	8,861.03	660
Eldorado, Ark., \$25,000.	4,202	9,727.45	480
Emmence, Ky., \$40,000.	1,274	4,402.53	193
Fairfield, Iowa, \$50,000.	4,970	28,798.31	750
Falmouth, Ky., \$30,000.	1,180	5,638.24	340
Fargo, N. Dak., \$250,000.	14,331	241,282.87	192
Forest City, Ark., \$25,000.	2,484	9,687.77	460
Georgetown, Tex., \$30,000.	3,066	12,281.22	984
Green River, Wyo., \$25,000.	1,313	4,370.18	600
Greensburg, Ind., \$45,000.	5,420	18,477.35	876
Greenville, Ala., \$30,000.	3,377	9,294.81	480
Highland, Ill., \$25,000.	2,675	9,611.45	650
Hobart, Okla., \$40,000.	3,845	14,134.97	884
Holton, Kans., \$35,000.	2,842	12,501.30	750
Huntingdon, Tenn., \$25,000.	1,112	4,156.60	360

Only 3 out of the last 18 is a small average to meet Burleson's liberal figures. These buildings will average an increased cost annually of from 300 to 500 per cent, according to the Treasury Department.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Huntsville, Tex., \$30,000.	2,072	\$10,707.61	\$900
Kissimmee, Fla., \$35,000.	2,157	12,048.85	420
Kittanning, Pa., \$50,000.	4,311	24,526.51	1,420
Lake City, Fla., \$35,000.	5,032	11,203.32	660
Lancaster, Pa., \$250,000.	47,227	185,543.28	None.
Lebanon, Ind., \$45,000.	5,474	18,287.34	1,180
Lenoir, N. C., \$30,000.	3,364	9,827.27	846
Linton, Ind., \$35,000.	5,906	11,988.51	1,150
Long Beach, Cal., \$200,000.	17,809	99,319.04	100
Lumberton, N. C., \$30,000.	2,230	12,433.98	780
Lyons, N. Y., \$40,000.	4,460	16,460.72	860
Madisonville, Ky., \$40,000.	4,966	12,615.03	660
Manchester, Conn., \$40,000.	13,641	10,462.38	425
Marengo, Iowa, \$30,000.	1,786	7,502.33	480
Modesto, Cal., \$65,000.	4,034	34,634.82	840
Monroe, Ga., \$30,000.	3,029	7,361.51	450
Montrose, Colo., \$150,000.	3,254	17,919.54	1,504

Only 2 out of 17 get past Burleson's estimates in the foregoing. Remember, he is sustained by the Treasury. Not one can be built profitably by the Government, according to Treasury estimates.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Mount Airy, N. C., \$55,000.....	3,844	\$11,692.02	\$360
Morgan City, La., \$40,000.....	5,477	8,370.63	960
Mountain Grove, Mo., \$40,000.....	1,722	12,836.07	960
Mount Olive, N. C., \$30,000.....	1,071	5,679.28	420
Mount Vernon, Ind., \$40,000.....	5,563	13,233.74	600
Murray, Ky., \$25,000.....	2,089	5,531.11	240
Napoleon, Ohio, \$35,000.....	4,007	12,854.36	660
Nephi, Utah, \$25,000.....	2,759	4,935.08	96
Newark, Del., \$30,000.....	1,913	11,388.31	1,110
Newcastle, Wyo., \$25,000.....	975	4,174.70	None.
New Martinsville, W. Va., \$40,000.....	2,176	10,538.29	622
Newton, Iowa, \$55,000.....	4,616	32,156.54	1,440
Niles, Ohio, \$55,000.....	8,361	26,674.27	1,104
Nyack, N. Y., \$50,000.....	4,619	25,257.19	824
Oakland, Cal., \$650,000.....	147,199	509,256.09	840
Oelwein, Iowa, \$40,000.....	6,028	16,333.03	1,260
Oneida, N. Y., \$55,000.....	8,317	33,153.88	1,900
Paris, Tex., \$170,000.....	11,269	46,498.85
Passaic, N. J., \$125,000.....	54,773	124,972.43	4,905

Here the average is better, but still less than half would be passed by Burleson's limit. The limit determined by Treasury estimates of proposed increased expenses would exclude 90 per cent of the last 18 items.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Pikeville, Ky., \$35,000.....	1,280	\$6,149.72	\$332
Provincetown, Mass., \$30,000.....	4,369	11,191.78	824
Rogersville, Tenn., \$25,000.....	1,242	5,466.83	190
Rossville, Ga., \$25,000.....	1,059	8,062.48	398
Sandersville, Ga., \$30,000.....	2,641	7,855.16	600
San Bernardino, Cal., \$70,000.....	12,779	47,247.08	1,892
San Francisco, Cal., \$600,000.....	416,912	3,324,489.34
Seguin, Tex., \$30,000.....	3,116	10,884.68	588
Spring Valley, Ill., \$30,000.....	7,035	10,372.32	543
Sterling, Colo., \$55,000.....	3,014	17,969.35	1,756
St. Johns, Oreg., \$25,000.....	4,872	6,751.25	300
Stuttgart, Ark., \$30,000.....	2,740	12,940.02	1,072
Sweet Water, Tex., \$35,000.....	4,176	14,349.94	675
Sylacauga, Ala., \$30,000.....	1,456	7,256.27	534
Trenton, Mo., \$85,000.....	5,656	14,387.87	1,020
Tyrone, Pa., \$80,000.....	7,176	98,485.58	2,450
Union Springs, Ala., \$25,000.....	4,055	7,027.98	None.

Some items of profligate waste are enthroned in the 17 items last named. Four pass muster limit urged by Burleson. Not more than one would be justified from Treasury estimates.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Unionville, Mo., \$30,000.....	2,000	\$6,950.44	\$450
Urbana, Ohio, \$50,000.....	7,739	22,967.85	1,084
Vermilion, S. Dak., \$35,000.....	2,187	13,266.10	850
West Plains, Mo., \$40,000.....	2,914	12,174.25	1,596
Westpoint, Va., \$25,000.....	1,397	5,039.37	None.
Waynesboro, Ga., \$25,000.....	2,729	7,022.26	400
Wellington, Kans., \$15,000.....	7,034	21,073.98	None.

In more than 90 per cent of above items it would be more economical to continue on present rental basis than to build. This is not a proper rule to adhere to in public affairs, but what possible defense can be offered to over 80 per cent of the proposed Government monuments that fail to pass the limit fixed by Burleson and are shown by the Treasury statement to be wasteful?

Extension, remodeling, etc.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Aberdeen, S. Dak., \$60,000.....	10,753	\$86,810.02	None.
Aiken, S. C., \$75,000.....	3,911	13,818.85	\$150
Albany, N. Y., \$10,000.....	100,253	679,446.07	None.
Albert Lea, Minn., \$30,000.....	6,192	43,636.28	None.
Alexandria, Va., \$75,000.....	15,329	36,547.46	None.
Appleton, Wis., \$50,000.....	16,773	62,818.91	None.
Atlantic City, N. J., \$60,000.....	46,150	307,308.09	13,700
Beaver Falls, Pa., \$58,000.....	13,316	43,718.35	None.
Boston, Mass., P. O. & sub., \$250,000.....	670,585	8,069,113.07	23,600
Butte, Mont., \$150,000.....	39,165	176,903.48	493
Columbia, Mo., \$12,000.....	9,662	57,279.94	None.
Decatur, Ill., \$50,000.....	31,140	152,410.29	None.
Findlay, Ohio, \$50,000.....	14,858	61,191.49	None.
Flint, Mich., \$100,000.....	38,550	124,574.58	None.
Fort Scott, Kans., \$5,000.....	10,463	34,351.90	None.

¹ See section 25, H. R. 17052. See Miscellaneous.

Extension, remodeling, etc.—Continued.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Harrisonburg, Va., \$60,000.....	4,879	\$26,924.45	None.
Houlton, Me., \$50,000.....	5,845	24,538.41	None.
Jackson, Miss., \$100,000.....	21,202	114,150.25	\$2,068
Jefferson City, Mo., \$50,000.....	11,850	75,837.05	None.
Kenosha, Wis., \$75,000.....	21,371	96,807.47	None.
Lowell, Mass., \$250,000.....	106,294	183,713.79	480
Manchester, N. H., \$225,000.....	70,083	170,999.64	None.
Minneapolis, Minn., \$100,000.....	301,408	2,625,454.86	None.
Missoula, Mont., \$35,000.....	12,869	55,838.69	None.
Mobile, Ala., \$100,000.....	51,521	175,899.86	3,456
Montclair, N. J., \$10,000.....	21,550	70,910.69	None.
Norfolk, Va., \$650,000.....	67,452	408,084.52	6,003
Norristown, Pa., \$55,000.....	27,875	72,230.37	None.
Oak Park, Ill., \$150,000.....	19,444	83,670.58	830
Plattsburg, N. Y., \$50,000.....	11,138	42,110.32	None.
Pottsville, Pa., \$50,000.....	20,226	63,719.44	None.
Providence, R. I., \$75,000.....	224,326	954,467.14	1,440
Roanoke, Va., \$75,000.....	34,874	174,315.84	240
Sacramento, Cal., \$50,000.....	44,666	437,816.28	1,320
Sarantown, Pa., \$100,000.....	129,867	543,981.26	2,070
Shenandoah, Iowa, \$40,000.....	4,976	68,266.65	None.
Sioux City, Iowa, \$335,000.....	47,828	416,151.14	1,360
Wichita, Kans., \$75,000.....	52,460	331,003.87	1,380
Williamsport, Pa., \$80,000.....	31,800	176,125.37

¹ See sec. 5, H. R. 17052 and miscellaneous list.

Increase in the limit of cost.

City and amount.	Popula- tion.	Receipts for 1915.	Annual rental.
Alexandria, La., \$30,000.....	11,213	\$53,138.70	None.
Bath, Me., \$10,000.....	9,396	26,122.96	None.
Boston, Mass., \$100,000.....	670,585	8,069,113.07
Chicago, Ill., \$4,250,000.....	2,447,045	19,650,961.89	(?)
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, \$88,200.....	7,291	19,490.84	\$5,592
Globe, Ariz., \$25,000.....	7,083	22,557.44	4,800
Jamestown, N. Dak., \$35,000.....	4,358	30,749.45	1,980
Juneau, Alaska, \$300,000.....	1,644	15,588.00	10,635
Lewistown, Pa., \$20,000.....	8,168	19,488.99	1,350
Long Island City, N. Y., \$100,000.....	185,891.69	5,400
Millville, N. J., \$25,000.....	12,451	21,833.07	1,019
Milwaukee, Wis., West Side, \$100,000.....	373,857	1,680,302.10	14,744
Narragansett Pier, R. I., \$10,000.....	1,250	8,252.31
Park City, Utah, \$10,000.....	3,439	8,002.91	None.
Rockingham, N. C., \$5,000.....	2,155	8,055.88	None.
Shelbyville, Ky., \$25,000.....	3,412	13,044.20	920
Stenbenville, Ohio, \$125,000.....	22,391	64,389.77	3,150
Sunbury, Pa., \$40,000.....	13,770	36,932.81	1,844
Wadesboro, N. C., \$5,000.....	2,376	6,704.12	400
Wilson, N. C., \$75,000.....	6,717	24,560.94	1,420
Yonkers, N. Y., \$51,500.....	79,803	158,408.99	3,333
York, Pa., \$25,000.....	44,750	141,704.03	None.

In conclusion, I offer the brief estimate of such bills expressed by Representative FITZGERALD, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the only chairman of a single important committee of the House who comes from a northern State. On February 17, 1913, he said in debate on the public-buildings bill, as previously stated:

I denounce as indefensible this method of passing a public-building bill. * * * It can not be defended from any standpoint of public necessity.

No one ever seriously claims the bill is to meet any "public necessity," but it is a time-honored bill for meeting hundreds of political necessities. Again I submit a tentative proposition that will relieve us from all responsibility for further annoyance with petty matters that now aggregate \$35,000,000 in the 1916 bill.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Surely.

Mr. PLATT. I notice the gentleman uses the word "city" all through his very interesting address in reference to very small towns of 5,000 and under. In the State of New York we have no cities of less than 10,000 inhabitants. It would strengthen the gentleman's speech to use the word "village" for the small towns.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from New York will find, if he cares to examine the report, that some of the towns in the 1916 bill are under 1,000. I thank him for the suggestion.

Mr. PLATT. They certainly ought not to be referred to as cities.

Mr. FREAR. I cheerfully accept the correction.

Mr. KELLEY. I did not have the privilege of hearing all of the gentleman's address, and I am wondering whether or not he has outlined some relief from this system.

Mr. FREAR. I have offered bill No. 18450, which provides relief. If adopted by this Congress, no delay will be incurred in needed public-building construction and Congress will immedi-

ately escape from a ridiculous and indefensible custom. It reads as follows:

A BILL PROVIDING FOR A PUBLIC BUILDINGS COMMISSION.

A commission composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General is hereby created, whose duty it shall be to receive and investigate all applications for Government public buildings wherever located. The commission may provide rules concerning the size of communities, post-office receipts, and rental paid by the Government in determining where public buildings are to be constructed, and shall determine the character, cost, and plans of every public building.

The commission shall annually prepare a report of its findings and recommendations, and the same shall be embodied in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Postmaster General. The amounts required to provide for the purchase of sites, construction of buildings, and purchase of needed equipment shall be included and made a part of the regular supply bills submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.

I thank you, gentlemen.

SECRETARY MCADOO PRESENTS REPORT—ESTIMATES GOVERNMENT FINANCES WILL SHOW \$115,000,000 BALANCE JUNE 30, 1917—BIG DEFICIT YEAR LATER.

Secretary McAdoo's annual report of the Government's finances, presented to Congress to-day, estimates that the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, will show a balance of \$115,000,000 in the general fund, but that the figures a year later, June 30, 1918, will show a deficit in the general fund of \$185,000,000.

OMNIBUS BILLS FOR BUILDING SHOULD BE DONE AWAY WITH, SECRETARY MCADOO'S BELIEF.

An emphatic recommendation that all "pork" be eliminated from the public buildings business of the Government is made by Secretary McAdoo of the Treasury Department in his annual report. The policy of authorizing post offices and Federal buildings in wholesale groups, known as "omnibus building bills," he urges should be abandoned, and that Congress adopt some other policy whereby buildings shall be authorized only in cities and towns where they are justified by the needs of the community, and at reasonable cost.

This recommendation is expected to start something in Congress. It is generally understood that an effort is to be made during the present session to get through another omnibus bill, carrying appropriations of about \$35,000,000, mainly for post-office buildings in small villages throughout the country.

In fact this omnibus building bill was introduced in the House by Representative FRANK CLARK, of Florida, last July. At that time Mr. CLARK stated that he expected to put the measure through Congress at this session. If such an effort is made it will doubtless precipitate a spirited fight.

SOME HAVE LOST TASTE FOR PORK.

It is well known that many members in both Houses of Congress have completely lost their taste for "pork," and will resist to the last ditch the passage of the bill in its present form. But should the advocates of the measure succeed in forcing it through both House and Senate, it is said that the President will veto it.

Following are extracts from the section of the report of Secretary McAdoo dealing with the subject of public buildings:

"Common sense and business judgment would seem to demand that structures for the transaction of Government business should be authorized only in localities where they are imperatively needed, and that buildings should not be erected where no public necessity can be shown. This result could be accomplished by divorcing the public-buildings question from all local or political considerations and authorizing no public buildings until a thorough and intelligent investigation of each proposed building or project has been made by this department and a full report thereon has been submitted to the Congress. If such reports were followed by the introduction and passage of separate measures to cover each proposed building project, the abuses and evils of the omnibus-bill method would be eradicated.

NEEDLESS BUILDINGS ERECTED.

"I am convinced that the methods pursued by the Congress for the past 15 years of providing Federal buildings through so-called omnibus public-buildings bills have resulted in the construction of many public buildings in small towns and localities where they are not needed, and at a cost which is clearly unjustified by any actual requirements of the communities in which they are erected. The conclusion is irresistible that authorizations for public buildings in these small communities are too frequently dictated by local reasons and without regard to the best interests of the Government.

"In the past two decades the Congress has authorized and appropriated approximately \$180,000,000 for public buildings, and the major part of this great sum has been expended on costly structures in small localities, where neither the Government business nor the convenience of the people justified their construction; and while the initial cost of these buildings represents a large waste of public funds, this is not the worst of it. The most serious aspect is this: The annual operation and maintenance of these buildings impose on the Treasury a permanent and constantly increasing burden."

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NEWTON IS RENDERING VALUABLE SERVICE.

Assistant Secretary Newton, in charge of public buildings, and who has made a resolute effort to curtail the waste in construction of needless buildings, made this further comment on the Secretary's report:

"There has never been a time when there was so urgent a need for large appropriations for public buildings as now. In nearly every city and large town the existing Federal buildings have been outgrown, and both the Government service and the people are sorely in need of relief.

"But the omnibus bills do not provide this relief. The major part of the authorizations in these bills are for post offices in country villages where every postal facility and convenience are adequately provided in rented quarters, at rentals ranging from \$100 to \$1,000 annually, whereas the cost of maintaining a Government-owned building averages about \$4,000 annually.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE—MARKETING OF FOOD PRODUCTS.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a change of reference of the House resolution 389, directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to the

House of Representatives the facts relating to the production, marketing, and distribution of food products in the United States, together with any violations of the antitrust laws in connection therewith, and recommendations for greater economy and efficiency in the marketing of food products and the punishment and prevention of extortion in the prices thereof, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary. This request is made because the resolution involves a violation of the antitrust laws:

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAINEY). The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that House resolution 389—

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if they expect to report on the resolution at this session?

Mr. BORLAND. I can not speak for the committee, but I hope to have a report on it at a very early date.

Mr. FARR. It is the gentleman's resolution?

Mr. BORLAND. I assure the gentleman I hope to have an early report on it.

Mr. FARR. Is it the gentleman's resolution?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the reference of House resolution 389 be changed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

REPORT OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS (H. DOC. NO. 1448).

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the report of the Sergeant at Arms to the House of Representatives, which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Accounts.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Saturday, December 9, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1916, showing the amounts expended at each school and agency from the appropriation for construction, lease, purchase, repairs, and improvements of school and agency buildings (H. Doc. No. 1450); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a cost account of all moneys, from whatever source derived, expended on each irrigation project on Indian reservations, allotments, and lands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1451); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of expenditures on account of the Indian Service for the fiscal year 1916 from the appropriation "Industrial work and care of timber" (H. Doc. No. 1452); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the fiscal affairs of all Indian tribes for whose benefit expenditures from public or tribal funds were made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1453); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry among the Indians on various reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1454); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the cost of all survey and allotment work on Indian reservations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1455); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of the expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry among the various Indians of the reservations during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1456); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1916, relating to the appropriation "Indian schools, support, 1916" (H. Doc. No. 1457); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement showing in detail what officers or employees have traveled on official business to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1458); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement of all expenditures from March 1, 1916, to June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1459); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an itemized statement of expenditures made by this department and charged to the appropriation "Repairs of buildings, Department of Interior, 1916" (H. Doc. No. 1460); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an itemized statement of expenditures made by this department and charged to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1916" (H. Doc. No. 1461); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement in detail showing what officers or employees have traveled on official business to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1462); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a memorandum of allowances granted payable from the appropriation for unusual conditions for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1463); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report of John T. Reeves, special supervisor, Indian Service, on need of additional land and school facilities for the Indians living in the State of Mississippi (H. Doc. No. 1464); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting annual report of the Attorney General of the United States for the year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1483); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting thirtieth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission (H. Doc. No. 1484); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a statement giving the requisite information as to labor-saving devices exchanged by the Navy Department, the naval service, and the United States Marine Corps for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1465); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting reports of expenditures of the Postoffice Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1466); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Postoffice Department and ordered to be printed.

20. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed statement of all expenditures under provisions of sundry civil act approved July 1, 1916, making appropriations for protection, improvement, and management of national parks (H. Doc. No. 1467); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department and ordered to be printed.

21. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting tabular statement setting forth the data asked for in House resolution 274 as shown by reports furnished by the adjutants general of the States of Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas (H. Doc. No. 1468); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

22. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Savannah Harbor, Ga. (H. Doc. No. 1471); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

23. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a statement showing in detail what officers or employees of the Library of Congress have traveled to points outside of the District of Columbia on official business for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1472); to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

24. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of

Claims for the year ended December 2, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1473); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the make, model, and serial number of each machine exchanged during the fiscal year 1916 and the period of its use (H. Doc. No. 1474); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

26. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting annual report of the Superintendent of the Library Building and Grounds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1490); to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

27. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements showing in detail what officers and employees traveled on official business to points outside of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1475); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

28. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of letter from the superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, transmitting the financial report (H. Doc. No. 1476); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the Adjutant General of the Army relative to the financial and other affairs of the United States Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and of the Pacific and Atlantic branches thereof, situated, respectively, on Alcatraz Island, Cal., and Governors Island, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 1477); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

30. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on irrigation of lands of the Shoshone or Wind River Reservations, including the lands of said reservation in Wyoming (H. Doc. No. 1478); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

31. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1503); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

32. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting report on diversions of Indian funds during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1504); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

33. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting report on hostilities by any tribe of Indians with which the United States has treaty stipulations since last report (H. Doc. No. 1505); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

34. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting reports of expenditures by the several bureaus and divisions of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1506); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce and ordered to be printed.

35. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the employment under appropriation for the valuation of carriers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1507); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting an analysis, by ranks and ratings, of the pay and allowances of the personnel of the Navy (H. Doc. No. 1508); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department and ordered to be printed.

37. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of the expenditures of the Coast Guard for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1509); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

38. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1493); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

39. A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a statement of expenditures made from the appropriations for contingent expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1510); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

40. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing each exchange of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1511); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing the diversion of appropriations for the pay of specified employees in the Indian Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1512); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

42. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures made from the tribal funds of the Confederate Bands of Ute Indians (H. Doc. No. 1513); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

43. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of the expenditures made in making per capita payments to the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1514); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

44. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of the expenditures made for the purchase of cattle for the benefit of the Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, in North Dakota and South Dakota, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1515); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

45. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures made for the purchase of cattle for the Northern Cheyenne Indians on the Tongue River Reservation in Montana, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1516); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

46. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement showing in detail what officers and employees have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1517); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

47. A letter from the Superintendent of Library Building and Grounds, transmitting certain information relative to travel from Washington, D. C., in connection with the official business of this office during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1518); to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

48. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures made for the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians on the Tongue River Reservation, in Montana, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1519); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

49. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of the expenditures for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, of money carried on the books of this department under the caption "Indian money, proceeds of labor" (H. Doc. No. 1520); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

50. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of all moneys collected and deposited during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, under the appropriation "Determining heirs of deceased Indian allottees" (H. Doc. No. 1521); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

51. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, showing exchanges made by this department and its several bureaus and offices of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices (H. Doc. No. 1522); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

52. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of expenditures from the permanent fund of the Sioux Indians during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1523); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

53. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report of expenditures for the relief of distress and prevention of diseases among Indians, on account of the construction of hospitals (H. Doc. No. 1524); to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

54. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting fifteenth annual report of the Reclamation Service (H. Doc. No. 1479); to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed.

55. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Warren W. Barnes v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1525); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

56. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Martha A. Boren, widow of Solomon V. Boren, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1526); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

57. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of

Harrison Berdan v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1527); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

58. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Harvey F. Woods v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1528); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

59. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Luther S. Trowbridge v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1529); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Daniel T. Wellington v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1530); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

61. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Thomas F. Davenport v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1531); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah A. Cosgrove, widow of Hugh J. Cosgrove, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1532); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

63. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of James H. Chaffin v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1533); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

64. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ferdinand Burch v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1534); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

65. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William P. Bogardus v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1535); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

66. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Richard L. Allbritain v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1536); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

67. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lee B. Slaten, son of Benjamin F. Slaten, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1537); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

68. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Marion A. Shafer v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1538); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

69. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Louise Schweitzer, widow of Gottlieb Schweitzer, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1539); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

70. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William H. Rose, son and sole heir of William B. Rose, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1540); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

71. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Cynthia M. Roberts, widow of Marcus F. Roberts, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1541); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

72. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ma Linda Pauley, widow of Shadle R. Pauley, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1542); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

73. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Walter R. Parker v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1543); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

74. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frank S. Nickerson v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1544); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

75. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah J. McAleer, widow of Hugh McAleer, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1545); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

76. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William L. Mitchell v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1546); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

77. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Levi L. Martz v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1547); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

78. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Lorenzo S. Knox v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1548); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

79. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Jane M. Kennedy, widow of James Kennedy, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1549); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

80. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *William H. Kellison v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1550); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

81. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Mary Litherland, widow (remarried) of John A. Jordan, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1551); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

82. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Edwin S. Hill v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1552); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

83. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Edgar L. Hendricks et al., children and sole heirs of William C. Hendricks, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1553); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

84. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Enoch H. Gurney v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1554); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

85. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Patrick De Lacy v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1555); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

86. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *John Spearow v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1556); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

87. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Horace F. Stevens, son of Benjamin F. Stevens, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1557); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

88. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Peter Thompson v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1558); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

89. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Henry J. Thompson v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1559); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

90. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Daniel W. Turnure v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1560); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

91. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *William M. Ware v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1561); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

92. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *William M. Watts v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1562); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

93. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *James P. Wheatley v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1563); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

94. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Jefferson White v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1564); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

95. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Carl Williams, son of John M. Williams, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1565); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

96. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of

Clara W. Ferguson, daughter of Charles W. Anderson, deceased, v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1566); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

97. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *William H. Angel, son of Charles A. Angel, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1567); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

98. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Martha J. Babcock, widow of Edwin F. Babcock, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1568); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

99. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Edwin L. Barber, son of Epaphras L. Barber, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1569); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

100. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Benjamin F. Lisk v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1570); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

101. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Charlotte J. Husted, widow of Henry Husted, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1571); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

102. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Dott N. Hill, widow of George W. Hill, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1572); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

103. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *John D. Spragins v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1573); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

104. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Leroy Rogers v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1574); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

105. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *John P. Robertson v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1575); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

106. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Seberiano Rivera v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1576); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

107. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Joseph Ray v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1577); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

108. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Thomas C. Underwood, administrator of William Randolph, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1578); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

109. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *John C. Porter v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1579); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

110. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *William N. Peet v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1580); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

111. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *John W. Patton v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1581); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

112. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *William L. McGrew and David McGrew, sons of John B. McGrew, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. 1582); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

113. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Thomas L. Moss, executor of John Moss, deceased, v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1583); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

114. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of *Edmund R. Loughry, Josiah Loughry, and Stanard Loughry, sons and sole heirs of Matthew Loughry, deceased, v. The United*

States (H. Doc. No. 1584); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

115. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Frederick Lanbrecht *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1585); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

116. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of C. Edgar Sutphen and John W. Osborne, executors of George L. Begbie, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1586); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

117. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Judah Howard, widow of William G. Howard, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1587); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

118. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Belle Palmer, widow of David G. Palmer, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1588); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

119. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mabel S. Wilson, daughter of Charles E. Stivers, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1589); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

120. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary C. Turner, widow of Matthew H. Turner, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1590); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

121. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Vashti Crawford, daughter of John L. Woodward, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1591); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

122. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of De Witt C. Alford, administrator of Charles B. Alford, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1592); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

123. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Fred Von Baumbach *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1593); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

124. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Charles H. Dunihue *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1594); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

125. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Willison C. Hall *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1595); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

126. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John C. Delaney *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1596); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

127. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Obadiah M. Knapp *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1597); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

128. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Jacques Kalt *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1598); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

129. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Parmelia A. Jackson Roberts, widow (remarried) of James S. Jackson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1599); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

130. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Arthur H. Humiston *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1600); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

131. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Jacob H. Houser *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1601); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

132. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mabel Henderson and Mary H. Fletcher, daughters and sole heirs of William P. Henderson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1602); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

133. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Samuel H. Haynes *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1603); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

134. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Maria M. Gray, widow of Henry H. Gray, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1604); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

135. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Victoria J. Golden, widow of William H. Golden, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1605); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

136. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Eugene H. Gipson, grandson of Cyrus B. Gipson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1606); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

137. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Agnes Gillies, widow of Donald Gillies, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1607); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

138. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John P. Gibbs *v.* The United States (H. Doc. 1608); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

139. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George L. Gegner *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1609); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

140. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of E. Ward Frank *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1610); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

141. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Catherine Fleming, widow of John M. Fleming, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1611); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

142. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lizzie Flagg, daughter of Henry G. Flagg, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1612); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

143. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Bourbon Bank & Trust Co., administrator of Joseph Fithian, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1613); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

144. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Martin G. Fields *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1614); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

145. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Leander Ferguson *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1615); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

146. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah J. Fallor, widow of Benjamin M. Fallor, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1616); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

147. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lewis Eiler *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1617); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

148. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah F. Kessner, widow (remarried) of Thomas J. Dugan, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1618); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

149. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Florence J. Dodge, widow of Jonas G. Dodge, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1619); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

150. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ernestine Deutsch, widow of William Deutsch, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1620); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

151. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Charles

L. Defose *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1621); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

152. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John P. Decker *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1622); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

153. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Margaret J. Cord, widow of Henry B. Cord, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1623); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

154. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Elizabeth Howarth, daughter of Daniel J. Cline, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1624); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

155. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Edwin L. Clark *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1625); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

156. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ketmah E. Wood et al., children and sole heirs of Stephen F. Ball, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1626); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

157. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph P. Aikens *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1627); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

158. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John P. St. John *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1628); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

159. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph R. Putnam *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1629); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

160. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Allison J. Pliley *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1630); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

161. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Francis M. Magee *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1631); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

162. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William E. Woodruff *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1632); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

163. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of James S. Wright *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1633); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

164. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ralph H. Thompson, executor of George W. Thompson, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1634); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

165. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Peter H. Pierson *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1635); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

166. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Henry F. Leib *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1636); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

167. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George W. Travers, executor of George W. Travers, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1637); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

168. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Charles D. Todd *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1638); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

169. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Milton Thompson *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1639); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

170. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Philander Talbot *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1640); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

171. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Daniel

Sullivan *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1641); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

172. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of James Steele *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1642); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

173. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Edward S. Salomon *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1643); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

174. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Park W. Smith et al., brother and sisters of James W. C. Smith, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1644); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

175. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George W. C. Smith *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1645); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

176. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Zenas B. Shipman *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1646); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

177. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Austin A. Scott *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1647); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

178. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Alice C. Sawyer, widow of Frederick A. Sawyer, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1648); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

179. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Lemuel Saviers *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1649); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

180. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George H. Ruple *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1650); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

181. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Rachel B. Purdy, widow of George H. Purdy, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1651); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

182. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Henry Purcell *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1652); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

183. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William W. Pate *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1653); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

184. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William H. Newlin *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1654); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

185. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sophy G. Clark, executrix of David B. McCreary, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1655); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

186. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Albert G. Lewis *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1656); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

187. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Amelia King, widow of Prettyman King, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1657); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

188. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Sarah P. Jenkins, widow of John H. B. Jenkins, deceased, *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1658); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

189. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Wiley S. Holland *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1659); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

190. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Shadrach T. Harris *v.* The United States (H. Doc. No. 1660); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

191. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Judea G. Davison, widow of Austin S. Davison, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1661); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

192. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of W. H. Graham, administrator of Milton Graham, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1662); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

193. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of David R. Connard *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1663); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

194. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Harrison Clark *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1664); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

195. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Simon Lyon, administrator of William T. Chapman, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1665); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

196. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Charles M. Carter *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1666); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

197. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of James L. Carpenter *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1667); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

198. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of James A. Stinson, administrator of Tilford N. Bruner, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1668); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

199. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of George W. Brown *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1669); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

200. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Austin L. Abbott *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1670); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

201. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Alice W. Rash, daughter of Humphrey W. Woodyard, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1671); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

202. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of John H. Wood *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1672); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

203. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Ira E. Starks *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1673); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

204. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Henry Ziesing *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1674); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

205. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph H. Yundt *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1675); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

206. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Victor Wolf *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1676); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

207. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Jacob R. Witmer *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1677); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

208. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William Wilmington *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1678); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

209. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Oscar D. Williamson, son and one of the heirs of Eleazer Williamson, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1679); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

210. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Henry

Wiley *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1680); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

211. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Henry O. Wheeler *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1681); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

212. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Thomas C. Weaver *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1682); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

213. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Helen T. Tyler, widow of Thomas E. Tyler, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1683); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

214. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Samuel E. Tubbs, son of Samuel S. Tubbs, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1684); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

215. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Joseph L. Thomas *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1685); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

216. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of James B. Thomas *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1686); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

217. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary E. Taylor, daughter and sole heir of John W. Taylor, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1687); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

218. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Isaac N. Taylor *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1688); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

219. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Hobart M. Stocking *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 1689); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

220. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that the estimates of appropriations for the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, be modified by striking out certain words (H. Doc. No. 1469); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 18374) to provide for an examination and survey of Elizabeth River, Va., including approaches thereto, with a view to increasing the width of the channel, and also the depth of the channel to 40 feet from above the navy yard to the sea; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 18375) prescribing a rule of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 18376) for the reduction of postage on first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SWIFT (by request): A bill (H. R. 18377) to incorporate the United States Platinum Corporation and to aid in the development of the mineral resources of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 18378) to create a commission on illiteracy to be known as the American Illiteracy Commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 18379) to authorize a report upon the necessity for certain bridges on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 18380) to investigate the condition of Indians living in Louisiana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 18381) to authorize officers of the National Guard called into the service of the United States for duty on the Mexican border June 18, 1916, or subsequently, who were under 30 years of age at the time of said call, to take the examination for provisional second lieutenants in the Regular Army under certain conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET: A bill (H. R. 18382) to regulate the weight of bread sold in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HASTINGS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 313) authorizing an investigation into the expenditure of money by committees, persons, firms, associations, and corporations to influence or to attempt to influence the result of the election of November 7, 1916, in respect to the election of the President of the United States or of any Member of the United States Senate or House of Representatives; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) inviting the people of the United States to visit the District of Columbia during the week of February 26 to March 4, 1917, to view the Capitol and inspect an exhibition of the various activities of the Government service; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BARNHART: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 65) authorizing the printing of the journal of the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 18383) granting an increase of pension to Emma S. Phelps; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 18384) granting an increase of pension to Mary Cronk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 18385) granting an increase of pension to John R. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18386) granting an increase of pension to Elsie A. Mahana; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18387) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia A. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 18388) granting a pension to Benjamin Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18389) granting a pension to Joe Emmet Reyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18390) granting a pension to William H. Andry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18391) granting a pension to Scott Farmer, dependent child of Eli Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 18392) granting a pension to John Avery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 18393) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Ragan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 18394) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Cowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 18395) granting an increase of pension to Chester P. Tryon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18396) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Quinby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18397) granting a pension to Ethel Borden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 18398) granting a pension to Henry Graf; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18399) granting a pension to Mary D. Holgate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 18400) granting a pension to Sarah Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18401) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Henry T. Shafer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 18402) granting an increase of pension to William W. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 18403) for the relief of the heirs of John Kensler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18404) granting a pension to Irvin L. Clifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18405) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shepler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18406) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18407) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Scharbrough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18408) granting an increase of pension to William McCann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18409) granting an increase of pension to David McKinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 18410) granting a pension to Amanda L. Dodson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 18411) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18412) granting an increase of pension to Francis Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18413) granting an increase of pension to John Blackburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18414) granting an increase of pension to Marion E. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18415) granting a pension to Ethan H. Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18416) granting a pension to Louis F. Moebus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18417) granting an increase of pension to David E. Rensch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 18418) granting an increase of pension to John E. Packard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 18419) granting an increase of pension to Harry L. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 18420) granting a pension to Anna Courtney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18421) to reimburse Robert Reid and Charles C. Eckliff, United States local inspectors of steamboats, for defending themselves on account of their arrest and prosecution growing out of the steamer *Eastland* disaster on the Chicago River July 24, 1915; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: A bill (H. R. 18422) granting a pension to Frank Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18423) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18424) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Fickle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 18425) granting a pension to Katharine Schellschmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18426) granting an increase of pension to George C. Sausser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18427) for the relief of Kate A. Wallace; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 18428) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Lafor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18429) for the relief of former Postmaster Clemens Leaf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 18430) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 18431) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Archibald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 18432) for the relief of Wells C. McCool; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 18433) for the relief of the heir at law of A. Beemer, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 18434) granting a pension to Sim J. Hyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18435) granting a pension to Samuel Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18436) granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 18437) granting an increase of pension to Ruth M. Hoag; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18438) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18439) for the relief of the heirs at law of I. G. Bugbee, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 18440) for the relief of the Peoples Bank of Bloomington, McLean County, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 18441) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 17515, for relief of John Wharton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: Petition of O. S. Reese and others, relative to extension of eight-hour law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of members of the Theosophical Society of Rochester, N. Y., protesting against deportation of women from northern France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers in support of House bill 17884, granting an increase of pension to Silas L. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: Memorial of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of McKeesport, Pa., favoring the improvement of national highways; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of American National Live Stock Association, Denver, Colo., relative to State regulation of railroad rates, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Rome, Ga., favoring embargo on food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Peter Van Schaack & Sons, of Chicago, Ill., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to William W. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorial of Board of Selectmen of Groveland, Mass., favoring the placing of an embargo on the export of wheat and other foodstuffs and urging the public ownership of coal mines and railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Board of Selectmen of Ipswich, Mass., urging an investigation of the high cost of living; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 4219, a bill to increase pension of Louis L. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATTHEWS: Evidence supporting House bill 17695, for the relief of William L. Wiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of Municipal Council of Lowell, Mass., for investigation of high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of employees in the maintenance-of-way department of American railways for an eight-hour day; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Branch No. 19, National Association of Letter Carriers, urging an increased appropriation for letter carriers' salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 8, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the King of Kings, the Lord of Lords, Thou dost preside with uncontrolled authority and power over the destiny of the nations of the earth. We believe Thou hast laid Thy hand upon us and given us a place among the nations. Thou hast lavished upon us with a prodigality of love and mercy that amazes the world the gifts of Thy grace and of Thy providence. We pray that Thou mayst lead us forth with a message to the world and an influence upon the governments of earth. We pray that we may take forth with us the inspiration of Thy spirit and of Thy truth that all our work begun, continued, and ended in Thee may accomplish the Divine purpose and plan in our national life. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of the governor of Massachusetts certifying to the election of HENRY CABOT LODGE as a Senator from that State for the term of six years beginning March 4, 1917, which will be inserted in the RECORD and placed on the files.

The certificate was ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1916, HENRY CABOT LODGE was duly chosen by the qualified voters of said Commonwealth a Senator to represent the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1917.

Witness his excellency Samuel W. McCall, our governor, and our great seal hereunto affixed at Boston, this 6th day of December, in the year

of our Lord 1916, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-first.

[SEAL]

SAMUEL W. MCCALL.

By his excellency the governor.

ALBERT P. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I have received a duplicate copy of the credentials of my colleague, which I ask may be received and placed on the files of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

Mr. WALSH. I present the certificate of election of Hon. HENRY L. MYERS, elected from the State of Montana a Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1917.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be printed in the RECORD and placed on file.

The credentials are as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, HENRY L. MYERS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, S. V. Stewart, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena this the 4th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1916.

[SEAL]

S. V. STEWART, Governor.

By the governor.

A. M. ALDERSON,
Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to state in this connection that my colleague [Mr. MYERS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness and that he will not be able to attend the sessions of the Senate for some time.

REPORT OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 1479).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifteenth annual report of the Reclamation Service, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed.

DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS (H. DOC. NO. 1706).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the documents received and distributed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, which was referred to the Committee on Printing and ordered to be printed.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL (H. DOC. NO. 1690).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement from the surgeon in chief of the Freedmen's Hospital of expenditures for professional and other services for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures on account of pay patients received into the Freedmen's Hospital during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1691), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPAIRS OF BUILDINGS (H. DOC. NO. 1460).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized statement of expenditures made by the Interior Department and charged to the appropriation "Repairs of buildings, Department of the Interior, 1916," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (H. DOC. NO. 1461).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized statement of expenditures during the fiscal year 1916 made by the department and charged to the appropriation, "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior, 1916," which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SUPERINTENDENT OF NATIONAL PARKS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of expenditures from March 1, 1916,